

A
168
L479

A STUDY OF THE DOMINANT CONCERNS IN FOUR COLLEGE STUDENT SUBCULTURES
" IN THE LIGHT OF THE GOSPEL FOR THE WORK OF THE MINISTRY

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of the Southern California
School of Theology at Claremont

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Religion

by

Richard William Lee

June 1968

PERMISSION TO COPY
HAS BEEN GRANTED
FROM AUTHOR.

This dissertation, written by

Richard William Lee

*under the direction of his Faculty Committee,
and approved by its members, has been presented
to and accepted by the Faculty of the School of
Theology at Claremont in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of*

DOCTOR OF RELIGION

Faculty Committee

F. Thomas Trotter

Allen J. Moore

Paul D. Betz

Date

June 1968

F. Thomas Trotter

Dean

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER | PAGE |
|--|------|
| I. THE SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY | 1 |
| II. THE NATURE AND USE OF TYPOLOGIES OF COLLEGE STUDENT | |
| SUBCULTURES IN THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH | 5 |
| Nature of Typologies of College Student Subcultures . . . | 5 |
| Use of Typologies of College Student Subcultures in the | |
| Ministry of the Church | 10 |
| The Collegiate-Vocational-Academic-Nonconformist | |
| Typology of College Student Subcultures | 23 |
| III. THE COLLEGIATE STUDENT SUBCULTURE | 33 |
| Biographical Glimpse of Collegiate Student | 33 |
| Origins and Character of Collegiate Student Subculture . . | 36 |
| A Theological View of Three Dominant Concerns of | |
| Collegiate Students | 44 |
| Fun and joy | 44 |
| Social skills and community | 47 |
| Loyalty and faith | 50 |
| IV. THE VOCATIONAL STUDENT SUBCULTURE | 53 |
| Biographical Glimpse of Vocational Student | 53 |
| Origins and Character of Vocational Student Subculture . . | 56 |
| A Theological View of Three Dominant Concerns of | |
| Vocational Students | 62 |
| Social mobility and justification | 62 |
| Technical skills and stewardship | 64 |
| Employment and vocation | 66 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| | iii |
| V. THE ACADEMIC STUDENT SUBCULTURE | 72 |
| Biographical Glimpse of Academic Student | 72 |
| Origins and Character of Academic Student Subculture | 76 |
| A Theological View of Three Dominant Concerns of Academic | |
| Students | 89 |
| Grades and grace | 89 |
| Scholarly discipline and discipleship | 93 |
| Knowledge and truth | 100 |
| VI. THE NONCONFORMIST STUDENT SUBCULTURE | 105 |
| Biographical Glimpse of Nonconformist Student | 105 |
| Origins and Character of Nonconformist Student Subculture | 110 |
| A Theological View of Three Dominant Concerns of | |
| Nonconformist Students | 134 |
| Identity and eschatology | 134 |
| Love and judgment | 139 |
| Radical democracy and the Kingdom of God | 146 |
| VII. SUMMARY | 155 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 158 |

CHAPTER I

THE SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This dissertation would contribute to the writer's understanding of the task of the ministry of the church among contemporary college students. Such a contribution is intended by a characterization of college student culture and theological reflection upon its character. The assumption throughout is that the more culturally informed the theological reflection upon the character of that culture becomes the better guided is the ministry of the church among the students forming and formed by that culture.

A usable characterization of American college student culture must steer a course between the too general and the too specific. The characterization in this paper is by means of a typology of four college student subcultures. That typology characterizes college student culture basically along the lines of student identification with the college and their involvement with ideas, makes four reasonably specific subcultural distinctions along those lines, and is short of being conceptually unwieldy in a paper of this scope. That scope requires a typology which is more generalizing than specifying about college student subcultures. Further discussion of the typology used in this dissertation is found in Chapter II.

The theological reflection upon the four subcultures characterized in this paper depends, among other things, upon what is meant in it by culture and theological reflection. Novelists and journalists aside, the chief characterizations of college student culture

have come from sociologists. To make use of many of the sociological characterizations of college student culture generally, and that of the typology of college student subcultures chosen for this paper specifically, a sociological definition is herein employed. College student culture is the students' "shared notions of what constitutes right attitudes and action toward the range of issues and experiences confronted in college."¹ Subcultural distinctions occur where groups of students hold different attitudes and take different actions toward the issues and experiences of their college careers or where certain attitudes and actions are dominant in a certain group of students while they are present, but recessive, among students generally. The sociological definition of culture above is abstract, and concrete details, for example, regarding the ways and places in which certain "notions" are "shared," the trials and rites in which certain "actions" are taken, and the times and seasons in which certain "attitudes" are struck need to be supplied when each subculture is discussed. Those details are supplied by novelistic, journalistic, historical, and anthropological studies of college student culture and some educational and psychological studies of college students.

The theological reflection in this paper is limited to three of the dominant concerns of each subculture. The attitudes heightened over others and the most prevalent actions taken by each subculture are assumed to be manifesting dominant concerns. This assumption is

¹Theodore Newcomb and Everett Wilson (eds.), College Peer Groups (Chicago: Aldine, 1966), p. 19.

suggested by Paul Tillich's thesis that the cultural life of man manifests his ultimate concern, not only in his theories but also in "the practical functions of man's spiritual life, the personal and social transformations of reality."²

Religion as ultimate concern is the meaning-giving substance of culture, and culture is the totality of forms in which the basic concern of religion expresses itself.³

In this paper a discussion of the "totality of forms" of "the personal and social transformations of reality" of college students is, of course, impossible. Nevertheless, some ways in which students take up certain attitudes and actions toward the realities of college life are discussable and to such a degree that their dominant, if not ultimate, concerns may be seen in the ways they handle their experience and decide the issues of contemporary college life. These dominant concerns are religiously significant, if not fully rounded religious, interpretations of their existence at that point at which the campus ministry of the church meets them.

The theological reflection upon the three dominant concerns of each college student subculture is attempted in the light of the gospel of justification by grace through faith in Jesus Christ and the Christian doctrines possibly relevant to the dominant concerns in which doctrines that gospel is ramified. Generally this means that the priorities different groups of students give to certain aspects of

¹Paul Tillich, Theology of Culture (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956), p. 42.

²Ibid.

college life in their attitudes and actions are judged for the ways in which they are thus open and thus closed to the gospel. The ministry of the church--be it by means of a campus pastor, teacher, fellow student, campus congregation, neighborhood church or other means--is to affirm the former and break open the latter by those words and deeds suggested by the gospel itself when the subcultural situation of the students is better and better understood.

The characterization of each college student subculture and theological reflection upon three dominant concerns of each is found in Chapters III, IV, V, and VI, and Chapter VII is a brief summary.

CHAPTER II

THE NATURE AND USE OF TYPOLOGIES OF COLLEGE STUDENT

SUBCULTURES IN THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH

I. NATURE OF TYPOLOGIES OF COLLEGE STUDENT SUBCULTURES

Nevitt Sanford says that those who serve and study college students "start by stating that each student in some respects is like all other students, like some other students, like no other students . . . and most of our work is somewhere in between."¹ It is the nature of typologies of college student subcultures to do their conceptual work "somewhere in between" the concepts of generality and uniqueness. The "middle distances" in which they work require abstractions of particulars which are more astringent than "what everybody knows" about college students and yet not so discrete as the biographies of each student.

Typologies . . . represent abstractions; it is in their nature to oversimplify, to mask the multidimensional variability known to exist within a given type. Yet as an abstraction a typology may well function as a valuable analytic tool--to organize meaningfully a wide range of data, to help understand whole networks of related variables, to facilitate communication about some segment of reality. Paradoxically, the typologies that have been the most parsimonious (and hence the most destructive to reality) have usually been heuristically the most significant.²

¹Charles Bidwell (ed.), The American College and Student Personality (Andover, Massachusetts: Social Science Research Council, 1960), p. 57.

²Richard Peterson, "On a Typology of College Students" (Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1965), p. 3.

Certainly oversimplifications must be conceded and some warnings raised in any typologizing of college student subcultures. First, types of subcultures are not simply types of students. The former are, of course, described in terms of the characteristics of the latter as, for example, in the case of the typology used in this paper. However, sociologists observe a distinction between the orientations toward college held by individual students and college student subcultures as "shared notions of what constitutes right actions and attitudes toward a range of issues confronted in college." The former are seen as giving content to the latter.

Secondly, subcultures as sociological analytic categories are sharper than actual campus subcultures. The latter may combine elements of more than one of the analytic categories. Peter Rossi says the most serious problem in the study of anything as informal as college student subcultures is their very detection and description in some unequivocal way, for

by definition, informal groups are without clear-cut membership criteria, locations, and structures. Furthermore, as groups they are more ephemeral, shifting over a period of time in their composition and their activities, since they consist in empirical patterns of behavior rather than as normative patterns embodied in a formal constitution.³

The difficulties in studying any informal group are exacerbated when the group is contemporary college students. The protean character of late adolescence, the mercurial rate of social change in our time to

³Theodore Newcomb and Everett Wilson (eds.), College Peer Groups (Chicago: Aldine, 1966), p. 193.

which college youth are the most vulnerable, and the sometimes bizarre ways in which the new generation appears make the patterns of behavior unusually difficult to discern, separate from one another, and interpret. Indeed, it now scarcely takes four years for violent men to strike the image of whole college generations and push all the students from the "now" to the "then" generation between their freshman and senior years. Surely whole generations have been oversimplified and have been shortened as they succeeded one another through the Lost, Silent, Beat, and Hip images in recent years.

Our natural urge to classify and type college students--"the silent generation," the "no-nonsense kids," the "uncertain senior," the "found generation," "the company men," "the careful young men," "the generation without heroes," "the intellectually godless," "our egocentric college youth," "the gloriously contented"--leads us to overlook the complexity that actually exists.⁴

Thirdly, no sociologist wants to encourage nonprofessionals such as the present writer into a game of naming the name of subcultures and then pigeonholing individuals, groups of students, or colleges. Rather, they would have typologies understood primarily as the heuristic devices they are for getting at the processes by which social groups shape student styles of life and the reverse. The non-professional will be immediately sobered of any temptations toward misplacing concreteness if he observes the way students typologize themselves. These types--greasers, mods, surfers, grinds, wonks, flick-outs, jocks, roughs, grubs, face men, closet cases, Christers,

⁴W. Max Wise, They Come for the Best of Reasons (Washington: American Council on Education, 1958), p. 3.

and the like--often function as pigeonholes. What began in early adolescence as mutual help through the discomforts of the then realized variety of conflicting possibilities in life--namely the forming of cliques and the stereotyping of one another, their ideals, and enemies--often needs to be replaced in the college years of late adolescence with better help. This better help lies near the heart of Christian faith, ministry, and community.

Fourthly, the kinds of behavior by which one subculture is identified may be taken up by another and transvalued. The attitudes behind the same actions may be different for different students. For a gross example, clothing styles which originate in a nonconformist subculture have a way of being assumed by conventional subcultures without the alienated and rebellious connotations such clothing possibly meant for the nonconformists. For a finer example, what some nonconformists do with LSD and marijuana for serious identity-seeking may also be done by more conventional students for fun and games. Specific kinds of behavior must be set in the largest pattern of behavior possible to guard against imputing inappropriate meanings to them.

Fifthly, there is some danger of conceptual parochialism, of being insufficiently aware of what typologies of college student subcultures bracket out of one's understanding of the very attitudes and actions under study. One would limit his understanding if he were to think the student subcultures on the campus he serves are the only determinants of attitudes and actions in addition to some slight amount of faculty influence.

On one hand students are affected by groups of their peers on other campuses in important ways, especially in a time of nearly instantaneous and youth-oriented mass media. On the other hand students are affected by groups of their peers off the campuses altogether. For an example in the first case, a student demonstration in Berkeley can arouse similar behavior among some students in a small, midwestern college who likely would not have been stirred to such attitudes and actions were it not for that distant group of their peers unlike any group available for interaction on their own campus. Indeed, these students may take up behavior patterns of their distant peers without due or similar local causes for such behavior. For an example in the second case, the Beatles and other groups of musicians for whom personal style is as important as sound, young Negroes in the ghettos, migrant workers, Peace Corpsmen, Vista Volunteers, civil rights and black power workers, Viet Nam soldiers, artists and actors, Hippies and other young people of the same age as college students affect student behavior in important ways even if they may not be personally in geographical propinquity. College student subcultures are not the only significant typologies for understanding student attitudes and actions.

To understand the defect in this point of view one must distinguish between three cultural systems: the mass youth culture, the formal college culture, and the specific subcultures of the college which include student subcultures. Any college peer culture to some extent combines elements from all three of these cultural systems. But the balance or mixture of these elements may differ considerably among subcultures in a college, and between colleges as well. How these are balanced in a given subculture may have a

good deal to do with the vulnerability of the student to the formal presses of the college environment.⁵

In summary, typologies of college student subcultures are useful ways of grasping some of the important social processes on the campus and to think and speak about student attitudes and actions when due regard is given to the further considerations that (1) typological abstractions conceal as well as reveal significant particulars and patterns of behavior, (2) typologies of subcultures are not simply co-terminous with certain individuals, (3) some kinds of behavior by which subcultures are identified may be taken up and transvalued by other subcultures, (4) typologies may be very temporary in character in times of rapid social change, requiring regular demolition of hardened categories, and (5) typologies of college student subcultures are not sufficient ways to identify all the influences upon students and understand their attitudes and actions without some further appreciation of their interaction with peers on other campuses and off the campuses altogether.

II. USE OF TYPOLOGIES OF COLLEGE STUDENT SUBCULTURES IN THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH

The chief use of typologies of college student subcultures in the ministry of the church is the enabling of its understanding of the persons and groups for whom that ministry is intended. The understanding of these persons and groups is helped by the sociological research

¹Bidwell, op. cit., p. 46.

of the last decade especially into college student culture, and such research provides data and heuristic categories upon which the church may bring theological reflection to guide its ministry.

The church shares a similar interest in this research as educators. The growth of American higher education in recent years in numbers of students and teachers, number of years for individual students in academic life, number of fields of study, physical facilities, public services, governmental and business research contracts, and secularization brings to colleges and universities groups of students whose attitudes and actions are not altogether familiar to academic men or churchmen. The former have increasingly and ironically been turning to social scientists to learn about the students they can or will no longer meet in their own classrooms and studies at sufficient length and depth to know personally. At least there is some irony in the observation that some of the demands for research which keep academic men from knowing their students in the classroom are demands for knowledge of students. As Paul Heist has quipped, the "new subject matter in higher education is the college student."⁶

If academic men are consulting social scientists for some understanding of the varieties of college students in order to teach them, the church has a similar interest in order to minister to them. The church, however, had its interests in knowing and understanding the concerns of college students long before psychologists and

⁶Hall T. Sprague (ed.), Research on College Students (Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1960), p. 37.

sociologists began their work on that population, and its major forms of ministering to them evidence some understanding of the changing character of college students. The history of the ways in which college students were beheld and served may be briefly noted in typological historical outline.

The sociologically informed knowledge of college student culture in a technical sense is, of course, decreasingly available the further back into history one moves. The generations grow longer, the "generation gaps" narrower, the college students fewer, and the college student culture less and less varied within itself. However, the history of the ministry of the church to college students, when outlined, provides some understanding of a succession of college generations. In some ways such an outline would be a typologizing of college student subcultures in a rude way for understanding them by means of what were thought to be the appropriate ministering words and deeds for them.

The history of American colleges and churches coincides with the rise of modern generational consciousness itself. Albert van den Heuvel, former Executive Secretary of the Youth Department of the World Council of Churches, argues that there were only a few peculiarly identifiable generations of young people before the eighteenth century.⁷ There was childhood and adulthood, but there was no adolescence, psychosocially speaking, or new styles of life advanced as a

⁷Albert van den Heuvel (ed.), The New Creation and the New Generation (New York: Friendship Press, 1965), p. 59.

youth culture, let alone a college student culture, not altogether embedded in culture as a whole. The forces of industrialization, urbanization, political and social revolution, geographical exploration, scientific method, rationalism and romanticism in thought and feeling, and college education itself, among other forces, tended to make sons significantly unlike their fathers and formed the field in which the American churches met the college generation. Since no society has accepted rapid social change, personal independence, and the transcending of one generation by the next as has the United States, the American churches have been called to unusually challenging youth ministries and to longer experience with adolescence, early and late, as a distinct kind of behavior and an identifiable youth culture than any other churches. Van den Heuvel goes on to say:

The moment freedom is discovered and each person must conquer his own maturity without being able to imitate the previous generation of adults, the simple facts of physiological changes take on the psychological complexities that Rousseau saw approaching. ["Does that mean that he was the first to see this change? Or did the change occur here for the first time?"] Adulthood until then defined in terms of skill, age, and task, now must be defined in terms of maturity, responsibility, and self-definition. The discovery that man is free to change, to progress, to discover requires a period in which these possibilities are seen, digested, and integrated into the personality.⁸

One place--and increasingly the major place--where that seeing, digesting, and integrating occurs in American society is the college. Here it is that each new generation comes to terms with the received culture, strikes its own image in terms of the degrees to which it accepts, rejects, and modifies that culture, and an important ministry

⁸Ibid.

of the church is discharged. In a sense that ministry is nothing less than the indigenization of Christian faith in each new generation. It is all the more tricky a task in the United States, observes Gordon Allport,

where to reject the church of the parent is one way of stepping forth as an independent adult in a culture where the child is expected to outstrip his parents in occupational, social, and educational accomplishments.⁹

The indigenization of Christian faith among American college students requires quite as much creativity and cultural analysis as would the actual transplantation of the church from one national culture to another.

The American churches have beheld college students in six main ways: (1) as prospective clergymen, (2) as gentlemen in waiting, (3) as tinder for revival, (4) as wards for nurture and protection, (5) as extracurricular and extraecclesiastical Christians, and (6) as part of the wider family of the church in a home away from home. A seventh way is in process, namely beholding them as (7) students in their own college culture.

The first way of beholding the college student is one which almost literally represents the transplantation of the churches from one culture to another, from the old world to the new. In the colonial period the church's ministry was the very founding of colleges for students, and in the broad sense these colleges were seminaries for prospective clergymen. The close relationship of the church and

⁹Gordon Allport, The Individual and His Religion (New York: Macmillan, 1962), p. 36.

college in this period left its mark on the church's thinking about the moral, doctrinal, and the classical character of the education of college students for a long time, as well as upon the colleges themselves in their mottoes, endowments, charters, curricula, and compulsory prayers.

The first stage in the relations of the American churches to the colleges dates from the founding of the nine colleges of colonial times, beginning with Harvard in 1636. These colleges were modeled on the Oxford and Cambridge pattern, suitably modified to accord with the demands of pioneer culture, and the divergent Church-State relations of the different colonies, but nevertheless they retained definite Christian orientation. Their main aim was to educate the leaders, lay and clerical, of church-centered communities.¹⁰

The second way of beholding college students overlaps the first and continues after the clerical image of the college student declines in dominance. Two centuries ago, and less, the majority of college students were the young establishment. Many Protestant churches behold the descendants of the Anglo-Saxon colonists, the rising Federalist establishment and Yankee commerce as very much their own kind of men and sought mainly to temper them with commitment to public service. Education was a finishing school, a time for acquiring polish, expression, familiarity with the classics, and perhaps a Grand Tour of Europe. Churchmanship tended to be noblesse oblige.

The third and fourth ways of beholding college students represent different responses to the same cultural change. The decline of the Puritan theocracies, the Federalist establishment gradually underweighing the rising masses of the Jacksonian democracy, the Deistic,

¹⁰Arnold Nash, The University and the Modern World (New York: Macmillan, 1943), p. 278.

sometimes atheistic, always rationalistic, early stages of the Enlightenment and the boisterous, free-spiritedness of its latter stages on the frontier brought about a period so secularized in American history that some comparisons with our own are appropriate.

There was much more extreme defiance of conventional, moral and religious standards by young people [after the Revolutionary War] than that experienced by young people following the War of 1914-1918. The fires lighted in France by our Revolution and rekindled by frenzied excesses by the French Revolution set loose the passions of youth of all lands and especially of our struggling Republic. For them the glories of Utopia had arrived. Distinctions of class, race, sex, color, and religion were all swept away. One can scarcely picture the atmosphere of the times except as a great world-wide emotional upheaval having in it many of the characteristics of a religious awakening.¹¹

Revivalism was one way the churches sought to counter secularism, and while it was a form of ministry embracing numbers greater than the college few, it was among those few and other young people that its influences went deepest. College students were seen to be in need of conversion, not only from the Enlightenment but also from those sins for which usually the young only have the strength. A regular visitor at most American colleges, where the turnover in the population left the campus less likely to be "burnt over" and where the ordinary developmental processes of adolescence (and not just late adolescence, for the students tended to be three to four years younger than contemporary college students) left the tinder dry, the revival was a major form of ministry to young people. The ultimate typology was that of the saved and lost.

¹¹Clarence Shedd, Two Centuries of Student Christian Movements (New York: Association Press, 1934), p. 37.

The really effective agency of religion in the life of the colleges was the revival, that almost inexplicable combination of confession, profession, joy, and tears which brought many young men into the church and into the ministry. Most college presidents and faculties of this era felt that they--or God--had failed a collegiate generation if once during its four years in college there did not occur a rousing revival.¹²

The fourth way of beholding the college student follows close upon the revival tinder image. The saved were seen in need of nurture and protection. The chief ministry of the churches to students as wards was the denominational college. A fiercely competitive, sometimes provincial and petty, often protective movement, denominational boosting in the history of American colleges nevertheless lays just claim to achievements unparalleled until the federal land-grant colleges for furthering higher education. If it appeared to the churches that new colleges were ever necessary--as correctives to their own older, now secularized, colleges, the colleges of other denominations, the barbarism and infidelity of the frontier, and eventually the state colleges and universities enabled by the Morrill Act--they did not flinch from the task for over a century. The student was frequently seen as the posterity of the denomination to be conserved, and his needs for piety, loyalty, discipline, and character formation were stressed more than his need for independent intellectual activity. The protective theme was so ingrained in the attitude of the churches that it later carried over into the early university pastorates they were moved to begin when the majority of their youth

¹²Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University (New York: Vintage, 1962), p. 77.

were to be found in state institutions of higher education.

The fifth way of beholding college students exploited the possibility of ministering to them outside the formal structures of both the colleges and churches. If Christian confession, reflection, and action were not possibilities for the whole of the campus--whether due to the pietism of the churches or the secularism of the colleges--a Christian student subculture might be a possibility. No form of ministry which was formally neither church-centered nor college-centered but student-centered is more prominent than the Young Men's Christian Association in its collegiate forms, and its ministry dominated the ministries to college students during the quarter centuries before and after the turn of the present century. It met the college student "not to father or mother, but to brother him,"¹³ and upon this difference in the image of the student--seen not paternally as a child but fraternally as a peer--hangs much of the strength of its work. Its weakness was the obverse of its strength. The colleges and churches were too easily able to let the YMCA and other organizations of the student Christian movement do their respective student personnel and the work of the ministry for them. The extracurricular and extraecclesiastical character of the student Christian movement left the parent institutions of college and church a little weaker for want of the integration of this vitality into their own lives, and the movement was weaker for want of the vitalities

¹³Clarence Shedd, The Church Follows Its Students (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938), p. 30.

of the intellect and tradition of the college and church.

The sixth way of beholding college students very much stressed the integration of the student into the life of the church, although the model of the church at work was the neighborhood parish and something of a fortress. Some dissatisfaction with the issues of the YMCA ministry as well as with the secularization of the colleges moved the churches into university pastorates late in the last century.

By 1880 the various denominations were beginning to feel uncomfortable in the new university atmosphere, and from this discomfort developed the university pastorate movement, the assignment of clergymen to work among college students, the growth of closer relationships between students and community churches, and the encouragement of denominational organizations in the colleges and universities. This movement was inspired in part by the appearance of sufficient numbers of Catholics and Jews at the institutions that were nominally Protestant in tradition.¹⁴

The ministries of the university pastors were often shielding, conserving, and fostering in character, as is witnessed in programs centered in foundation houses "off campus" and given to fellowship, recreation, hospitality, and fun. The work was seen to be a holding action much to the exclusion of other actions, "for to hold future leaders in thought and life . . . to the church," observed one spokesman, "is not only the church's solemn duty to them and to her Lord, but it is even necessitated by the fundamental law of self-preservation."¹⁵ The churches assumed an in loco parentis attitude toward students they assumed were part of the wider family of the church in a home away from home.

¹⁴Rudolph, op. cit., p. 459.

¹⁵Shedd, Church Follows, p. 30.

The conception that characterized these early denominational campus Christian fellowships was that of providing a "home away from home." Since not all of the churches' youth did--or, for that matter, could--attend the approved denominational colleges, it was determined that something should be done to retain them for the church and preserve them from the vicious secularism of the state and private universities. The church determined to follow its youth to college, and its philosophy of the campus ministry was that of nurture. Sometimes it bordered on protection. The churches built large fraternity-type houses near the campuses where student pastors lived with their families and their expanded family of students.¹⁶

The different ways the churches beheld and ministered to college students puts one in touch with some of the realities of college student culture. The churches met real humanistic needs among the prospective clergymen in their church-state colonial colleges, and they probably instilled some of the nobler virtues into the gentlemanly scions of the Federalist establishment. Revivalism met a need of the young for "experimental" religion, and the scattered, little, denominational colleges and academies met real local needs for learning and religion. The YMCA "enworlded" the gospel for several generations of students moving away from pietism toward theological liberalism and more prophetic concern for social issues, and the university pastorates probably met real needs of first generation college students who welcomed a church "home" in the unfamiliar and increasingly unfamiliar environment of the modern university.

When one turns to the contemporary period of the churches' ministries to college students, so much diversity in the forms of that ministry obtains as to make the students intended in them difficult to

¹⁶John Cantelon, A Protestant Approach to the Campus Ministry (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964), p. 14.

see. While some of the diversity is the accretion of both lingering and vital forms from the past, much of the diversity is a form of faithfulness to the present. There is presently a variety of students for all of whom no one form of ministry would be congruent. There is an evident concern for the student as student, and a rising concern for the varieties of students as students. That is, the vocation, campus culture, and psychosocial situation of the student as student are taken with greater seriousness in the ministries of the churches, and the student is beheld less embedded in his other identities of family, social class, race, nation, and even the church itself in a denominational and parochial sense.

We have been interested in understanding the student as student, as late adolescent, facing the hopes and fears of his generation, immersed in the context of college or university life, with the experiences of stress and the resources for growth which are characteristic of such communities.¹⁷

Acting on the concern for students as students, two main directions are being taken in contemporary ministries. The first accents the academic role of the student and attempts the undergirding of his academic work with whatever resources Christian faith and life can bring to his studies. It attempts to establish identifiable "Christian presence" on the campus in the form of a student congregation which is centered in worship and sacramental practice and is orbited by study groups and a great deal of pastoral counseling. The second accents the wider worldly involvements of students in social and

¹⁷Perry LeFevre, The Christian Teacher (New York: Abingdon Press, 1958), p. 125. *Italics added.*

political action, community and foreign service projects, and experimentation in the arts and popular culture. It seems to eschew traditionally identifiable "Christian presence" and is more of a ministry in events.

The primary characteristics are the refusal to relate primarily to a visible Christian group with permanent existence. . . . [This ministry employs] a non-programmatic approach to the campus as a whole without sharp distinctions between "Christian" and "non-Christian;" usually a rather charismatic, free-wheeling campus minister; and work which finds its focus in events rather than in groups.¹⁸

The increasing interest in college students as students is reflected in this paper. While the ministry of the church is not usually involved in educational activities like the admissions process, campus planning, and curriculum construction of most colleges where typological considerations have been helpful, it is involved in the preaching, teaching, and counseling of students where typological considerations help the enworlding of the evangel in this generation.

"The church," writes Glen Martin in the keynote chapter of The Campus Ministry, "which wishes to develop an effective campus ministry must first understand the campus in all its complexities and find ways to be significantly relevant in its various structures and subcultures."¹⁹

¹⁸James Monsonis, "Trends in Campus Ministry," (mimeographed report to the National Council of Churches, New York, 1966), p. 9.

¹⁹George Earnshaw (ed.), The Campus Ministry (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1964), p. 99.

Campus ministry is concerned with persons in the academic community at every level, but it would be naive to assume that all levels can be dealt with together in one chummy fellowship. If a ministry is to be valid and relevant, it must be based on a careful analysis of the specific patterns of work, needs, and value systems of the major subcultures at which it is directed.²⁰

III. THE COLLEGIATE-VOCATIONAL-ACADEMIC-NONCONFORMIST

TYOLOGY OF COLLEGE STUDENT SUBCULTURES

Burton Clark and Martin Trow offer a simple typology of four most distinguishable college student subcultures.²¹ The types of subcultures emerge from the dichotomizing of two variables: the degree to which students are involved with ideas and the extent to which students identify with their colleges. Diagrammatically, the typology is seen in Figure 1.²²

| | | Involved with Ideas | |
|-----------------------------|--------|---------------------|------------|
| | | Much | Little |
| Identify with College | Much | ACADEMIC | COLLEGIATE |
| | Little | NONCONFORMIST | VOCATIONAL |

Figure 1.--The Clark-Trow Typology

²⁰Ibid., p. 97.

²¹Burton Clark and Martin Trow, "Determining College Student Subcultures" (mimeographed study paper for the Center for Study of Higher Education, Berkeley, California, 1960). The more available, slightly revised, version of this paper is published in Newcomb and Wilson.

²²Newcomb and Wilson, op. cit., p. 24.

When this typology is used in research, a short paragraph description of each type is presented to students and they are asked to choose the one description which best describes themselves. Data from other sources about the students--academic majors, parents' income, residences, grades, religious and political affiliations, extracurricular pursuits, attrition, psychological characteristics, and the like--may then be organized around the four types until a more and more detailed picture of each type of student subculture is achieved. The description of each subculture follows in the next four chapters of this paper. Here some elaboration of the typology itself is made.

The Clark-Trow typology was first offered in 1960 and gave great impetus to the study of student subcultures. The typology has been widely used in sociological research and has also come to be used by educators, journalists, and other commentators on college student culture.²³

The typology is usually used with apologies. Many, including the originators, wish for a better typology even while they warmly receive and widely continue to use the Clark-Trow typology. Some of its deficiencies are evident even without the advantage of sociological instruction.

Two dimensions only of the attitudes and actions of students

²³Jonathan Warren, "College Student Subcultures as Dimensions of Behavior" (unpublished paper read at American Educational Research Association, New York, February 18, 1967), pp. 1 et seq.

are very broad ways to go after the richness and variety of college student culture. The two dimensions, however, are surely among the most important dimensions of student attitudes and actions, and they can provide a basic framework around which other data can be meaningfully gathered.

Some ambiguity exists within the types. Students in both the academic and nonconformist subcultures are both highly involved with ideas, and their different levels of identification with the college sometimes make ambiguous subcultural distinctions. Nonconformist may be too strong a word and too laden with rebellious meanings for some students highly committed to ideas and weakly identified with the college. A music or theatre student, for example, who is very intellectually committed and spends most of the time out of class in off-campus music or theatre groups is somewhat philistinely called nonconformist.

Commitment or lack of commitment to ideas is a very broad distinction between nonconformist and vocational subcultures. Finer things are at issue, for example, in the circles in which the typical elementary education major moves and the circles in which the singer and writer of social protest songs moves than the absence or presence of involvement with ideas.

While both the collegiate and vocational subcultures are weakly committed to ideas, they both place a high value on status. In some instances one could ask whether their different social contexts for their actions are weighty enough distinctions to make in the common status-seeking in attitude. A fraternity man developing his brothers

for use in future business associations and a night-school commuter developing his draftsmanship for future use in a job will move in different circles, but there may be much similarity in attitudes.

The conscientious academic student who is working under meritocratic pressures to please his professors and qualify for graduate or professional school may have as vocational an interest in his studies as the vocational student who is similarly hard-working to qualify for a license or advancement to a better job.

There is certainly much that is distinct and apt in the sub-cultural distinctions of the Clark-Trow typology, and one is well led into important student characteristics by its strengths. At some times, however, one is especially aware of how parsimonious a typology it is, and those times need to be noted. The most systematic criticism of the Clark-Trow typology from a sociologically professional point of view has been lodged by Charles Bolton and Kenneth Kammeyer.²⁴ Their criticism chiefly questions the appropriateness of the term "subculture" for the different attitudes and actions typologized. Two requirements of their definition of subculture are not adequately met by the Clark-Trow typology. One is the requirement that the right attitudes and actions must be held and enforced by some group of persons who are in persisting interaction, and the second is that they must differ from the normative value system of the larger society.

First, Bolton and Kammeyer question whether the Clark-Trow

²⁴Charles Bolton and Kenneth Kammeyer, The University Student (New Haven: College and University Press, 1967), p. 124 et seqq.

subcultures have a local habitation as well as a name. Are they actual groups of persons in persistent interaction? They point up the residual character of the nonconformist subculture in which possibly isolated and disparate students are aggregated. They point up the scant social intercourse in the vocational subculture. They grant some persistent interaction to the collegiate and academic subcultures due to their close identification with the college but see little to compare them with, to use their examples, the Old Order Amish or the ghettos of orthodox Jews.

This writer can only assert some common sense in defense of the Clark-Trow subcultures as subcultures quite near to the Bolton-Kammeyer sense of the term. A visitor who lingers on a campus and explores its environs could be convinced that actual groups of students do body forth the attitudes and actions in question and are subcultures, although not in the extremely restricted sense in which the Amish and Jews above are adduced as subcultures.

Generally one is well directed to seek the collegiate subculture in fraternities, sororities, athletic teams, homecoming committees, many student governments, and many other co-curricular activities. The nonconformist subculture bodies forth frequently in various leftist political groups, in groups like the Students for a Democratic Society and the Student Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee, the "free universities," in the offices of various underground journals, some film societies, and other places where what is admittedly a "movement" nevertheless gathers. The academic subculture is well incorporated in the staffs of many student newspapers, the radio station, some

honorary societies, various houses of study, and indeed in their classes and seminars themselves where a close relationship with the faculty is sought. The vocational subculture is possibly habitually gathered in a few places on campus like the student union, a few departmental clubs, sometimes in married students housing, and in commuter pools, although it is true enough that persistent interaction for the vocational student who is also a commuter may dissolve into groups of two or three as they bolt for the same bus or parking lot. There are, however, enough places and groups--some with constitutions or institutionalized guiding purposes, an authority system, and means for controlling certain attitudes and actions--in which the Clark-Trow subcultures body forth, enable communication among its members, and have a basis in reality. The groups are admittedly not tidy in their membership, and more than one group exists in which any one subculture embodies itself. It would be difficult to be a good member for long in most social fraternities or a football team, however, without embracing collegiate attitudes and actions and having them socially reinforced. Similarly, it would be difficult to hold membership in SDS or take serious part in various organized peace and civil rights protests without embracing nonconformist attitudes and actions and having them socially reinforced. It is even conceivable that some peer pressures in the vocational subculture obtain regarding keeping courses "practical," the curve low, and the examinations objective and confined to the facts one needs on the job. Even if we accept the requirements of the Bolton-Kammeyer definition of subculture, there are good grounds for arguing that the Clark-Trow typology deals with actual

groups of students in relatively persistent interaction.

Secondly, Bolton and Kammeyer question whether the Clark-Trow subcultures are really set apart and opposed in their attitudes and actions to a parent or dominant culture. Clark and Trow seem nowhere to make such a claim for their subcultures. Generally they recognize student subcultures to be emanations from the larger society. With the possible exception of some attitudes and actions in the nonconformist subculture, the Clark-Trow subcultures are not attitudes and actions in opposition to those to be found in American culture as a whole. It would be surprising if many were, for students bring certain attitudes to college with them as well as take certain ones with them back into American culture as a whole. Even in its extreme, "generation gap" could not mean utter discontinuity and novelty in attitudes and actions between the young and the old. What it can and often does mean is that the young are identifying with a different part, indeed subculture, of culture as a whole than they have in the recent past. It is often the shift of one college student subculture into prominence, either by increasing in size or getting the publicity that actions furthest from the general norms of society usually gather, which constitutes "generation gap." In recent times, for example, the student nonconformists have identified with many of their elders--Malcolm X, Fidel Castro, Timothy Leary, Henry Thoreau, Mohandas Ghandi, Albert Camus, Paul Goodman, and others--with whom only a few of their elders would also identify. Often the identification of the young with a part of the adult society with which the majority of adults do not identify is the meaning of "generation gap."

It is also to be observed that the elders immediately available for interaction in the colleges embrace attitudes and actions which, if they were all emulated, would encourage much of the subcultural differences among the students. That is, some of the student subcultures may be in part emanations from faculty subcultures. The four subcultures of the Clark-Trow subculture could find their counterparts in the faculty and administration. Cosmopolitans, locals, young turks, old guards, pure researchers, applied scientists, and other terms used to describe different faculty orientations to the issues of college life for them are labels for attitudes which are similar to those found in different student subcultures. Clark himself has typologized college faculties along lines similar to those with which he and Trow have typologized college students, as can be seen diagrammatically in Figure 2.²⁵

| | | Committed to Disinterested Study | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------------------------------|---------------|
| | | Much | Little |
| Identify with College | Much | SCHOLAR-TEACHERS | DEMONSTRATORS |
| | Little | RESEARCHERS | CONSULTANTS |

Figure 2.--The Clark Typology

²⁵Terry Lunsford (ed.), The Study of Campus Cultures (Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, 1963), p. 44.

While this paper does not concern itself with ministry beyond students, a full ministry on a campus would, of course, include the faculty--and strategically so for the sake of the students.

The Bolton-Kammeyer criticism of the Clark-Trow typology for its failure to designate one parent or dominant culture to which the student subcultures are opposed or at variance is rejected in this paper as too narrow and restricted a definition of subculture. Division by opposition is not the only or even chief way one moves from the concept of culture to subculture. Nor does the fact that many attitudes of student subcultures are found elsewhere in the faculty or culture as a whole forbid one from speaking of them as subcultures. The Clark-Trow typology defines a subculture simply as a segment of the student body where certain attitudes and actions are taken toward the issues of college life and leaves the variations in attitudes and actions which distinguish each subculture from that of the college community as a whole or from other segments of the student body open to an analysis of each type. Sometimes there is division by opposition, sometimes not.

Bolton and Kammeyer prefer to use the term "role orientation" to subculture. They acknowledge certain role orientations could derive in part from college student subcultures.²⁶ Since Clark and Trow recognize that the attitudes and actions of their subcultures derive in part from cultural sources outside of the subcultures, the differences in the two positions close up somewhat. The differences,

²⁶Bolton and Kammeyer, op. cit., p. 130.

although real, are not weighty. Indeed, when one looks at the basic Bolton-Kammeyer typology of role orientations, it reads like a variation and inversion of the Clark-Trow typology, as can be seen diagrammatically in Figure 3.²⁷

| | | Importance of Developing the Ability to Get Along with People | |
|--|------------------|--|---------------|
| | | High | Medium or Low |
| Importance of Vocational Training | High | PRIVATISTS | VOCATIONALS |
| | Medium or Low | CONVENTIONALS | ACADEMICS |

Figure 3.--The Bolton-Kammeyer Typology

This writer does not see how the Bolton-Kammeyer typology above significantly sharpens the heuristic tools for understanding the varieties of college students. In some ways its language is even less precise than that of Clark and Trow, and when it is made more precise, it becomes unwieldy. The Clark-Trow typology will be observed and amplified in the next four chapters of this dissertation.

²⁷Ibid., p. 151.

CHAPTER III

THE COLLEGIATE STUDENT SUBCULTURE

I. BIOGRAPHICAL GLIMPSE OF COLLEGIATE STUDENT

Bob White sets the brake on his Mustang at the curb of the Lambda Chi Alpha house, gathers his accounting and marketing books, this month's Playboy, his sports jacket from the cleaners, and a new Kostalanetz record from the back seat, and walks toward the house. Bob is a sophomore at Ohio State University, enrolled in the college of Business Administration, and just moved into the house last fall. He has entered into the life of the campus quickly. Already he holds office as the pledge trainer for his house, serves on the homecoming committee of the student senate and on the social committee of the student union.

As he jogs up the walk, he waves his free hand to two Tri-Delts across the street. Their names elude him at the moment, try as he does to make associations to remember names, and he gives them a big grin and "Hi" as they pass. Promising himself he will look up their pictures and names in the yearbook, he enters the house.

Jim and Al greet him loudly with some playful grasping at his copy of Playboy, and short struggles ensue in which Bob saves his phonograph record at the loss of the magazine. Jim and Al unfold the "Playmate of the Month," wince that she's not their type--too skinny around the staples--and offer it back to Bob in exchange for his car keys. Bob laughs, tosses the keys to Al, and goes up to their room.

In a way, Bob is glad to give his roommates his car, for he will have a few minutes to himself in the room before dinner. He is seldom alone for even a few minutes the whole day.

In his room he kicks off his loafers, sprawls on an overstuffed chair, stares around at the room filled with a few pin-ups, a stop-sign on which he reaches out to hang his sports jacket, an immense poster of Colonel Sanders, a gallon Schenley bottle made into his desk lamp, assorted strewn clothes, and OSU pennants, dried boutonnières from last year's formals, and some pictures of his dad and himself on a fishing trip in Canada last summer. He closes his eyes. It has been a busy day, and a busy night lies ahead.

Rushing for the spring semester is almost over, and all the time he has given to meeting the rushees will be doubled when their pledging begins. It takes a lot of time to shape them up. He just hopes they get a larger and sharper pledge class than the Phi Delt. Tonight he must go through the files downstairs for the back copies of the house's collection of accounting lab reports to copy some problems, get over to the student union for a meeting of the social committee regarding the Pan-Hellenic Spring Mixer, and then to the library to meet Ann for a little passion. "Those guys better have my car back by then," he muses, "the ground is still too cold and wet."

Next year Bob hopes to have a Thunderbird. His dad owns the Ford agency in Shaker Heights, a comfortable Cleveland suburb, and Bob intends to join him in the business upon graduation. Perhaps he will first enter the Air Force, following out his present AFROTC course, but he will worry about that when it comes. Meanwhile, "Bob White" and

Son Ford" is both his father's dream and that of Bob, junior, too.

Opening his eyes, Bob lets them fall on his shoes in the corner. They got scuffed today while he was playing touch football with a bunch of guys who decided to seize the first fine day of spring and cut Professor Hagerty's marketing class. They divided themselves into the "Bulls" and "Bears" and made a fine showing for the "Bull Market-eers," although the "Bears" had another surname for them. As soon as he has that pledge class shaped up, all his shoe shining will be over for a while. Bob likes to maintain a sharp wardrobe, has Ivy inclinations in dress, and really reads Playboy for the styles. He is a good dancer, dater, and keeps himself in good physical shape with weights, a sunlamp, and intramurals for house teams.

Bob fiddles with the radio, but he can only get the news. He turns the radio off and puts his new record on the stereo. Beside the stereo is a copy of the evening paper, which he turns to the funnies, then to the sports pages, and lastly to the financial section to check some of his stocks before picking up his Playboy. He lights a cigarette, uncaps a beer from the ice box in his room, and studies the ads. He notes carefully the Mod influences slipping slightly into the Ivy styles and makes a mental note to pick up some Paisley ties.

The first dinner gong rings. Rushees are expected for dinner, so he washes up, waxes his crew cut, chews some Sen-Sen to rid the beer from his breath, puts on his sports jacket and adds the lapel pin, and goes down to meet them. He is a good mixer, likes to sell, and is one of the ablest face men in the house. He is also genuinely fun to be with, easy to take, and loyal to the chapter. If Bob has anything

to do with it, it should get a good pledge class this year. If they each look a lot like Bob, how could they fail?

II. ORIGINS AND CHARACTER OF COLLEGIATE STUDENT SUBCULTURE

Clark and Trow describe the collegiate student generally as one who is deeply identified with the life of his college and minimally committed to ideas. More specifically, he prefers the social life and extracurriculum of college to the academic life and the curriculum. He highly values interpersonal relations for acceptance, peer guidance of his own behavior, and the skills he learns for impressing and manipulating others. He obviously does enough academic work to remain enrolled and to acquire some cultural sophistication, but he is not inclined to take up any more of the loneliness of scholarship or the pressures of difficult subjects than required. He seeks fun, friendships, popularity, is loyal to this fraternity, club, team, and college, and becomes a mainstay in the alumni association. His behavior is other-directed and predictable, his political and religious views conventional, his manners smooth and deferential to his elders, save on occasional escapades, and he is generally encouraged in his behavior by administrators who like a stable campus.

The collegiate student usually comes from the middle and upper middle classes, has sufficient money and business prospects for entertainment and to free him from the rigorously vocational training aspects of college, and tends to see his B.A. or possibly an M.B.A. as terminal degrees. He is usually attracted to the small residential college or to the fraternity row in the large state university. Mass

media frequently exaggerate his leisure, drinking, singing, parties, and sexual playfulness. He actually is serious about his college education and does not let his studies interfere with it. By virtue of his enthusiastic participation in committee work, Greek life, social activities, and campus politics, he learns how to master the human environment and organize others sufficiently well to lead them from the middle.

The origins of this type of student and his subculture can be traced, in part, to the English college model of higher education adopted by American institutions of higher education at their inception and, secondarily, to the bureaucritization and prosperity of American life in the early twentieth century.

The English model of higher education at the time of its American importation was that of a small, residential community of teachers and students in which gracious manners and good morals were goals of education as important as the knowledge of the classical curriculum itself. Research, publication, and vocational training either did not exist or were secondary in importance. Professional education was limited to the ministry, law, and medicine. Libraries and laboratories were minimal or did not exist, for the important and lasting learning was to be obtained in the chapel, the commons, the dormitory, and eventually the athletic fields. The majority of students were already marked for their places in society upon graduation, being generally of the wealthy and ruling class, and the development of their character, wit, style, social relationships, and capacities for sound politics, commerce, and leadership within a

stable world were the priorities of the college.

The collegiate model of higher education is much beleaguered in contemporary American higher education by the developing multiversity and for other reasons to be explored in the chapter on the academic student subculture. Like much of the past, however, it has not disappeared; it is merely submerged beneath the present. Beneath the large American universities devoted to research and graduate studies lie the undergraduate "colleges." Among the vast majority of American undergraduate students who attend the large universities are many collegiate students to add to those who still take their undergraduate years in small, private, often church-related residential colleges. The collegiate student is still very much on campus if a recent study of the Educational Testing Service of 13,000 freshmen in twenty-three diverse institutions is an adequate sample and age-group.

Of the 13,000 students participating in the study of entering freshman [sic], only 18.5 subscribed to the Academic orientation, and 26.5 to the Vocational. As might have been anticipated, the Nonconformists comprised a mere 4 per cent of the total. But the big surprise lay in the percentage of students subscribing to the Collegiate orientation, an overwhelming 51 per cent, or slightly over half!¹

While the contemporary collegiate student has his roots in the English model for higher education, he would be uncomfortable in it in its purity. He would be particularly uncomfortable in it in its Puritan austerity in colonial America. Certainly its earnest moral supervision, classical curriculum, and rather grim religiousness would

¹Ronald Barnes, et al. (eds.), The Aim of Higher Education (St. Louis: United Campus Christian Fellowship, 1966), p. 14.

be unfamiliar. For, during the course of the history of the college in American higher education, his collegiate forebears had reformed the collegiate way of life more to their own and his liking.

The collegiate way of life is almost totally the work of students upon the basic English model, the creation of a co-curriculum encircling the curriculum. From the time of the colonial colleges to the early decades of this century, a student movement turning the colleges to collegiate uses was underway. The close identification with their college which distinguishes the collegiate students in the Clark-Trow typology is most often a close identification with co-curriculum which is, at bottom, "their college." Certainly the collegiate student does not identify with the curriculum as strongly as does the academic student.

Collegiate student attitudes and actions have been distinguished from those of the faculty, sometimes to such a degree that two cultures and colleges, "ours" and "theirs," would seem to exist on one campus. The student activities have been called the extracurriculum to distinguish those activities "outside" the curriculum or, more intimately, the co-curriculum to distinguish those activities "beside" and "around" the curriculum from those activities "within" the curriculum. Those who feel these divisions particularly invidious prefer to make the division geographically by class and extraclass or classroom and campus activities, thus trying to stress one curriculum to be run in two or more places. Another, rather Puritan, division is made by speaking of the life and work of the college. The words of Woodrow Wilson, president of Princeton during a heightened collegiate period

much to his disliking, are famous regarding this distinction.

Life at college is one thing, the work of the college another, entirely separate and distinct. The life is the field that is left free not only for athletics, but also for every other amusement and diversion. Studies are no part of that life, and there is no competition. Study is the work which interrupts the life, introduces an embarrassing and inconsistent element into it. The faculty has no part in the life; it organizes the interruptions, the interferences.²

However the division is made (the present writer prefers curriculum and co-curriculum), collegiate student activities usually mean things like athletics, student government, clubs, committees, fraternities, sororities, yearbooks, handbooks, bands, choirs, student unions, dramatics, songfests, parties, dances, homecomings, pinnings, queen contests, hazings, and some plain shenanigans. But they can also mean things which have since become so intimate a part of the curriculum that their co-curricular origins have been forgotten. Not only are departments of speech, drama, art, physical education, certain modern foreign languages, and music sometimes the result of co-curricular influences upon the curriculum, but so also are libraries and laboratories which were frequently maintained by student groups in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries before they were maintained by the colleges themselves.

A whole range of what in time became respectable academic subjects received their first significant encouragement in the colleges from students, their clubs, their journals, their glee clubs, their dramatic groups, their libraries.³

²Herbert Stroup, Toward a Philosophy of Organized Student Activities (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1964), p. 142.

³Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University (New York: Random House, 1965), p. 23.

Even today, one need only look through college catalogs to see that activities one college deems curricular are in others deemed co-curricular and vice versa. The contrast between the curriculum and the co-curriculum in some colleges is formal at best. "The extra-curriculum is not only a threat to higher education," Kate Mueller goes so far to say, "it is higher education."⁴

The historical pattern seems to run like this: (1) students initiate collegiate activities to compensate for the curriculum, (2) some of these activities are taken into the curriculum, (3) some are taken into a professionally directed co-curriculum and undergirded by a progressive philosophy of education, and (4) the cycle repeats itself, although with the newer collegiate activities now initiated to compensate both for the enriched curriculum and the professionally directed co-curriculum.

At the present time, when the collegiate student subculture is in some slight decline on some campuses, one sees a new co-curriculum coming forth which is not centered on the campus but is and will continue to have important curricular ramifications. A co-curriculum which is to be "life" for students at "work" in the curriculum cannot be anything less, an active minority to be treated in Chapter VI may be saying, than life itself. The reform of the colleges worked by the collegiate student subculture in the past may be work more and more taken up by the nonconformist student subculture in the present.

⁴Kate Mueller, Student Personnel Work in Higher Education (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1961), p. 300.

Involvement for a minority of students in the issues of war, poverty, civil rights, the repressiveness of the managerial revolution in business and government, and rising militarism may be the new co-curriculum far worthier of serious attention than the old. Certainly their involvement in issues of educational reform and the liberalization of restrictions on individual behavior are more to change the curriculum and college regulations than to compensate for them,

The most sensitive barometer of what is going on at a college is the extracurriculum. It is the instrument of change, the instrument with which generations of students, who possess the college for but a few years, register their values, often fleetingly, yet perhaps indelibly. It is the agency that identifies their enthusiasms, their understanding of what a college should be, their preferences. It reveals their attitudes toward the course of study; it records the demands of the curriculum, or the lack thereof. It is a measure of their growth. And because it is the particular province of lively imaginative young men and women, not immobilized by tradition, rank, authority, and custom, the extracurriculum is likely to respond more quickly than any other agency of the college to the fundamental, perhaps not yet even clearly expressed, movements in the world beyond the campus and to the developing expectations of society.⁵

A secondary source of historical understanding of the collegiate student subculture is the present bureaucratization and prosperity in American society, underway side by side since the turn of the century. From the beginning of this century to World War II the more objectionable characteristics of the collegiate student from an academic point of view were forged. "Joe College, B.M.O.C." is the stereotype. The collegiate life, hitherto reserved for the elite and aristocrats of American society, became available to the middle and upper middle classes with their increasing wealth. Furthermore, business and

⁵Rudolph, op. cit., p. 23.

economic life became more bureaucratic and upward mobility was no longer guaranteed by ruggedness, ambition, and practical skill. There is just enough truth in the books, How to Succeed in Business without Really Trying and How to Become a Bishop without Being Religious, to enforce collegiate values in adult life. One has also to be able to win friends and influence people in bureaucratic life. College student culture becomes a kind of training ground for those manipulating social skills. The "socially enterprising" courses in advertising, business administration, public relations and management, and home economics were developed. A distinctively non-academic subculture of student activities developed on many campuses, and on some it was so pervasive as to be the student culture. For the collegiate student the faculty is less important than his peers. Among the latter he wins his popularity and assures his attractiveness, does his important learning about handling people and conforming, and develops his own rites of social ascent and rewards. His outlook upon the world may emphasize fun, games, and intellectual indifference, but it also emphasizes, observes Kenneth Keniston, those social skills which do the work of his world for him and hold some promise for doing the work of the bureaucratic adult world as well.⁶

The much scored apathy of college students in recent years was primarily applicable to the collegiate student. His apathy toward ideas, then and now, was and is due in part to his passion for other

⁶Robert Morison (ed.), The Contemporary University: U.S.A. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966), p. 326.

things, like social skills. The college student researches reported up to the 1960's were monotonous in their findings that so many students were so little affected by the intellectual and moral values the college faculties sought to promote. Actually the many collegiate students up to that time were likely defending themselves from the faculty's disfunctional values in the larger bureaucratic society.

Student culture mediates the values of the faculty and those of the society at large, because too much change would be disfunctional in the lives of most students. Students had to leave the collegium and return to the world of business, the professions, and the like. They could not permit themselves to become so alienated from this world that they could not return to it with some degree of equanimity. So it was that student culture very neatly turned the trick of socializing students well enough to meet faculty demands, and yet not so well that their education made return to families and communities difficult or impossible. In this process the faculty wielded the power. Students were, in a sense, a subject people. Exceptions and individual vagaries were numerous. But by and large, most students took guidance and direction from this student culture which was designed to incorporate and at the same time limit faculty encroachment.⁷

III. A THEOLOGICAL VIEW OF THREE DOMINANT CONCERNS OF COLLEGIATE STUDENTS

Fun and Joy. The strong interest of collegiate students in fun is well expressed and fortified by their subcultural activities. Dances, sports, fraternities, sororities, singing groups, reviews, combos, student unions, special party weekends and much else are organized for its sake. The youthful immediacy and spontaneity of life, the

⁷G. Kerry Smith (ed.), Higher Education Reflects on Itself and on the Larger Society (Washington: National Education Association, 1966), p. 149.

action and sensuousness enabled by good health, and the encouragements of advertising and the availability of consumer goods especially marketed to the young suggest a time of life for seeking its good pleasures. Indeed, one of the educational tasks seized by some colleges presently is teaching the next generation more and better uses of leisure, a greater responsiveness to their own feelings, and a deeper delight in their own sense experience. One sociologist, commenting on what he calls the "emergence of fun morality," says:

Where formerly there was felt to be the danger that in seeking fun, one might be carried away into the depths of wickedness, today there is a recognizable fear that one may not have enough fun. . . . Not having fun is not merely an occasion for regret but involves a loss of self-esteem. I ask myself: What is wrong with me that I am not having enough fun? . . . Fun and play have assumed a new obligatory aspect.⁸

It was once one objective of student ministries to provide "good, clean fun" for students. This often meant social and recreational activities to compete with dancing, theatres, night clubs, drinking, fraternities, petting, and other activities different denominations considered morally objectionable. The activities of the church, often conducted in foundation houses, had a way of providing a kind of collegiate life for Christians. While these activities were preferable to simple moral strictures against the pleasure-seeking of the young, they were frequently too feeble and infantile to compete with what their pagan peers could offer Christian students. Worse,

⁸Truman B. Douglas, "New Forms of Ministry: Novelty or Renewal?" Information Service, XLVI: 7 (April 8, 1967), 3. Douglas does not cite original source.

they were frequently activities which confused Christian joy with "good, clean fun."

The number of spaghetti suppers served and cups of cocoa consumed in college student Christian groups which seldom celebrated the eucharist are symbols of this confusion. The very communion on the campus which might well have celebrated the whole of life in deeper and freer sacramental practice was more wont to ape its collegiate environment than to embarrass the ersatz sacraments of collegiate life. The Sanctus sung in the fellowship of the neighbor and "all the company of heaven" really makes a better drinking song than the "Whiffenpoof," and it is the cantus firmus for all other good songs and toasts celebrating the heaven and earth full of His glory.

Certainly it is not only the sacramental practice of the church as cultus which gives expression and interpretation to Christian joy; it is also the sacramental approach to the whole life of culture. The simplest difference between fun and joy may be that the former is sought to forget our troubles and the latter received in the middle of them when their meaning is clear. Collegiate fun is often compensatory in character, and even professionally directed co-curricular activities sometimes proceed on the basis of a psychology of emotional release of impulses constricted in the curriculum. The co-curriculum becomes a forgiveable, if enviable, expression of the high spirits of exultant youth. Such a division between the work of a student and compensation for that work in the co-curriculum of collegiate activities need not be reinforced by the ministry of the church. In Chapter V the theological

questioning of an impulse constricting curriculum occurs in the light of Christian discipleship shed on academic discipline.

Here it needs to be said that the joy the church knows in the gospel is not compensation but celebration. Sacramentally, it lays the sins, guilt, weariness, frustration, fears--and joylessness--of men on the Christ who overcomes them all. It celebrates not the compensations for the troubles of men but the victory of Christ over them all for men. Men's work has meaning as a sacramental participation in that victory. Fun, too, has meaning as a sacramental participation in that victory. That meaning in work is its joy. And that meaning in fun is its joy. The ministry of the church is not the advocacy in word and deed of funless joy--that would limit the victory it celebrates--but it is out to embarrass joyless fun by its own, yet more excellent way of life.

Social Skills and Community. The great concern for sociability and social skills in the collegiate student subculture is, like all the concerns singled out in this paper as prominent in each subculture, very ambiguous in its subcultural forms. The churches in America are themselves just emerging from a period when "togetherness," winning friends and influencing people, and the social aspects of "positive thinking" were dominant in their own lives. Departments of "public relations" were set up beside departments of mission and evangelism, and the social activities of the churches, especially in the new suburbs, filled their calendars. Indeed, where the collegiate subcultural norms call for an outgoing, easy-going, affable approach to inter-

personal relations and for what has been called "other-directedness," the religiously oriented students are most likely to be gathered.⁹ Criticism of collegiate social activities from a Christian perspective on the gospel must bear in mind that these activities are often good preparations for the actual practices of contemporary churches.

A Christian criticism of the strong interest of the collegiate student in sociability and social skills must distinguish any approvable desire for community from the disapprovable means of seeking the desired community and the manipulation and dominations of others which work against that community. Surely the need for community is very great at the college time of life. Going up to the residential colleges where collegiate students tend to gather involves the loss of family and home friends and the need for new primary relationships to recover the loss. Furthermore, the frequently impersonal and competitive classroom experiences and the loneliness of study exacerbate the sense of loss.

But most students find the strain of work that must be done in the solitude of their own minds very considerable. New student habits today show ingenious ways of studying in "syndicates" and, above all, in twos. From one point of view we must see these as evasions of proper solitude, but we cannot help them to use solitude without fear unless we first see that they enjoy personal relations in their academic life. For the freedom to be solitary depends on a stable position in the community and the hectic search for companionship often reveals how unsure of that they are. Solitariness and isolation are two quite different experiences. A true academic experience should mean a breaking out of isolation into a life of communication, with contemporaries and with

⁹Rose Goldsen, et al., What College Students Think (Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1960), p. 180.

teachers, with the living and the dead, with members of one's own society and with "strangers" of many types.¹⁰

Genuine community is so rarely found in American society, and it may be that the residential college experience is as close to it as anyone can come. As far from the mark as it may be, it is likely closer than the community achieved in the suburbs, shop, business, and even the home where there is probably less integration of life and work today than in the college. This situation in the larger society, of course, does not excuse the judgment necessary where the collegiately attempted community is based upon individuality suppressing conformity, superficial similarities, and manipulated enthusiasm, as can be the case in many collegiate activities. A Christian judgment, however, needs the support of Christian community--based upon the mediation of Christ, love, forgiveness, listening, serving, and regard for individuality--as a lively option to the attempted community it questions. Thomas Langford sees a causal connection between contemporary students looking to the college for "positive redemptive community" and the "church's failure to embody meaningful common life."¹¹

The manipulating social skills which are sought in the collegiate subculture are to be called by their right names and the fear they express allayed. A nonconformist college generation of ten years ago began to call the manipulation of their collegiate peers "phoney."

¹⁰Marjorie Reeves (ed.), Eighteen Plus (London: Faber and Faber, 1965), pp. 109-10.

¹¹Thomas Langford, "Campus Turmoil: A Religious Dimension," Christian Century, LXXXIV (February 8, 1967), 173.

While it still may be as necessary for the ministry of the church to judge the "I-it" character of many collegiate relationships and the thingification it wreaks upon the neighbor, it is now as important that the other edge of the sword of Christian judgment be used to heal the collegiate student himself. One cannot thingify the neighbor by considering him or her a "mark," "lay," "contact," "rush material," and the like without thingifying the self. The church as community on the campus may be able to disabuse some students of frantic social skills in its common life where manipulation is confessed and increasingly unnecessary, and it may be one model among others for bringing the modern university closer to a community of communities.

Loyalty and Faith. The kinds of loyalties aroused and expressed in the collegiate student subculture may too easily be dismissed as trivial. David Riesman predicts that

soon faculties, having first sought out social scientists to discover how to diminish the influence of the collegiate culture as a drag on academic pursuits, may come around asking us how to restore a vanished harmony of interests.¹²

Loyalty to the ideal of individual academic excellence, to classes which do not function as a group, and to subject matter specialties in undergraduate studies may be at odds with desirable loyalties to the college or to any larger entity.

It can be argued, further, that because a stage of unquestioning loyalty to the group is a natural part of growing up in a society like ours, it cannot be omitted without disrupting to some extent the whole course of development; if it is not lived through at

¹²Theodore Newcomb and Everett Wilson (eds.), College Peer Groups (Chicago: Aldine, 1967), p. 281.

the appropriate time some need for it will remain--and be a source of susceptibility to totalitarian appeals later on. . . . If we are to have intelligent leaders in our society, then our most gifted young people must somehow learn to be at home among men. For this the experience of cooperating in the work of a group is essential; and if this is not offered in school, then it must be offered in college. This means, of course, that the college must break down the false dichotomy of "the intellectual" on the one hand and everything else about the person on the other.¹³

A Christian judgment of collegiate loyalties cannot simply be an academic one, possibly condemning them for their triviality and encouraging sharper and sharper academic inroads into the activities arousing those trivial loyalties in order to rout them. Christian ministry has no special calling to elevate the exercise of the intellect over the exercise of the body, feelings, will, or any other human faculty, but a calling to seek their harmony and full devotion to God and man.¹⁴

A Christian judgment of collegiate loyalties is as careful to weigh their idolatry as their intellectual disrespectability. Loyalties which are substitutes for the openness of faith are the special concern of Christian ministry. The kinds of collegiate loyalties which buttress status without stature, racism, and conformity out of fear of difference and the arrival of the future need scrutiny. Keys, pins, Greek letters, athletic letters, yearbook notices, kings and queens, and the like may stand for loyalties in which the collegiate student seeks his justification.

Participation in ritualized behavior by college students may be more educative (changing the person's character) in student

¹³Earl J. McGrath (ed.), Universal Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), pp. 55-56.

¹⁴Luke 10:27-28.

activities than in curricular studies. . . . Apparently the maintenance of striving and achieving behavior is based in part upon the use and abuse of appropriate symbols. The use of Greek letters as titles for social organizations, the meaning in student affairs of athletic letters, the location of eating cliques in the common dining room, the listing of officers in the yearbook, the wearing of keys and pins which portray a mysterious symbology to the uninitiated--these and other symbols found in student activity systems are related to problems of the student's social status.¹⁵

Faith which receives divine acceptance in spite of human unacceptability and so frees one from striving to serving must be contrasted with loyalties which seek justification for the individual who conforms to be acceptable to the group, special favors for the group, and the security of all from the demands of larger entities which merit higher and more difficult devotion. The truly loyal college student to his fraternity, club, team, and college is the one who knows there is no justification of himself in his loyalties and is free by faith to question and change them.

¹⁵Stroup, op. cit., p. 103.

CHAPTER IV

THE VOCATIONAL STUDENT SUBCULTURE

I. BIOGRAPHICAL GLIMPSE OF VOCATIONAL STUDENT

Joe Ferrone pushes his way through the crowd at a train station on the west side of Chicago, his book bag over his shoulder, a slide rule on his belt, a small transistor radio to his ear to hear the last of the top ten tunes of the week. He walks toward Wright Junior College where he is a sophomore in the electronics program. At the end of this year or sooner Joe must decide whether to take his certification and get an electronics technician job or try to get into the electrical engineering program at the Illinois Institute of Technology. His marks are good enough to give him a crack at electrical engineering, and with some extra work in math before he would go up to IIT he could probably do it. Perhaps he will do both, take the job and try for the engineering degree at the same time.

His other alternative is the Navy. Actually, electronics technicians are not being hired very fast in Chicago right now. The Navy, however, will give him a good classification and further electronics education if he enlists. He has already spent three years to finish up two years of junior college, each quarter taking twelve hours--just enough to keep him draft deferred and permitting him to hold down nearly forty hours of work as a technical assistant in an all night radio station. He works graveyard. Joe has two rents to raise each month, one for his mother and three kid brothers and one for

himself now since he moved from their home to his own rented room. His moving out was hard on his mother, Joe having been the head of the house since his father died two years ago, but he had to get into some digs where he could study and be closer to his job. Nobody in his family has gone to college before, and they don't know what it takes when you have to study. Joe takes as many meals at home as he can and still has his closest friends right in his home neighborhood among his old high school friends, brothers, and relatives.

Joe's college campus is really the city itself and especially his old neighborhood which blends with the college and envelops it. His transition from high school to college meant moving from the second floor to the third floor of the same building. While his job cuts him off from the activities of the college, they are so merged with high school he has outgrown them anyway. His girl friend, Maria, is a senior in the high school. She has business college and secretarial school plans, but she would drop them quickly to become Mrs. Ferrone. Joe thinks he has no marriage plans now. He wants first to square away his college training, his military service if his support for his mother does not defer him, secure a good job, and be sure his brothers get started out well and can take care of themselves and their mother. Maria needs a little more time to teach Joe that marriage interferes with none of these things, but helps them. She stands ready to help support him while he studies, be a further draft deferment for him and deliver another, and to sister his brothers. She is a better talker than Joe, and time is on her side.

As Joe climbs the third floor stairs, his eyes fall on the

large bulletin board outside the placement office at the landing. Many students are gathered there now as always. Joe scans the announcements for electronic technicians. No new notices have been added since the beginning of last quarter. Mostly there are all the old ones for TV repairmen and the usual assembly work announcements of places at Zenith. He walks to a Coke machine, draws a cup, carries it cool in his fingers to a battered lounge for the student commuters and sits down at a table littered with old Life, Look, and Time magazines. He flips through an issue of Life, glancing at the pictures. Pictures of a riot-torn city catch his eye. "Damn niggers," goes almost up his throat to his lips. He turns several pages at once. Pictures of a liturgically experimental Roman Catholic mass catch his eye. He studies the pictures skeptically, decides he prefers the masses he usually misses and turns on, stopping at a full-page ad for a Buick. He admires it, imagines it in his own driveway in his dream house in Skokie, smiles, chews the ice in the bottom of his cup, and puts the Life down on some Time magazines. Joe's father was a punch-press operator. Joe will do better than that.

He walks into his Circuits class, sits near the door so he can make his dash for the 6:15 train when it's over in order to get to work on time. He trades some banter about the assignment with Leo Markowski, who is already enrolled at IIT for this fall and has definitely decided to go after the full college degree. The B.S. has earthier associations for them than IIT intends it to mean. Yet Leo and Joe both respect the degree for the respect it will bring them in

the personnel office. It also means Buick and Skokie, and it means Boot Strap.

II. ORIGINS AND CHARACTER OF VOCATIONAL STUDENT SUBCULTURE

Between the times of the prominence of the gentlemanly student in the early nineteenth century and the prominence of the collegiate student in the early twentieth century, there occurred the rise of the vocational student. Recently this type of student has flourished again for some of the same reasons he first appeared, although in very different ways.

During the time of the extension of democratic rights in America in the first half of the nineteenth century and the recession of the Federalist establishment, a new conception of education began to emerge. It was a conception taking more and more of the facts of nineteenth-century America into its formulation. Some of these facts were a vast land to explore, travel, mine, and farm; a land of developing industry, technology, and business; and a land of common people, mostly immigrants, who were to govern themselves. Perhaps the most important fact was the developing ideology that in this land a man could improve his situation in life by thrift, hard work, cleverness, ambition, a little luck--and education. Some have observed that near the turn of the nineteenth century the real religion of America came to be education.

No wonder education so quickly became the American religion. No wonder all the founding fathers were educators--Franklin, Washington, John Adams, John Dickinson, Noah Webster, and, above all, Thomas Jefferson. Education was to be the instrument of change, change of nature (science was to make that

possible) and of human nature. Education was to be what religion had been in a less secular age--the chief instrument for the regeneration of the human race.¹

In the Clark-Trow typology the vocational student is one with minimal commitments both to the college and to ideas. He is little interested in either for its own sake, neither in collegiate fun and the learning of social skills nor in intellectual discussions and wide reading for the play of theory. His interests are in his degree, occupational skills, practical training, the placement office, employment, and a good income. He identifies with that part of American ideology which stresses technical know-how, upward mobility by means of hard work, and success in materialistic terms.

From the grounding and funding of the land-grant colleges for the advancement of agriculture and mechanics through the Morrill Act of 1862 to the first National Defense Education Act's provisions favoring the natural sciences and technologies a century later, the state and federal governments have invested large sums in the training of its citizens for the work of the nation. The Service Men's Re-adjustment Act of 1944 ("G. I. Bill"), the rapid growth of junior colleges, and the economic federalizing of the multiversity with extensive research facilities have also been intended to develop technology and train students in its techniques. Waves of immigrants were once acculturated by means of American high schools and taught skills with which to compete in the economy. Presently, racial

¹Earl J. McGrath (ed.), Universal Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), p. 4.

minorities see high school and college education as means for advancement. In a technologically changing and accelerating world, more and more students must now apprentice at the colleges. Business and industry regularly send recruiters to the colleges with attractive offers of employment and further training. It is small wonder that many students hold vocational attitudes toward college.

Contemporary vocational students tend to come from a relatively low socio-economic status, primarily the lower middle class. Most are the first in their families to go to college, and in some cases to have finished high school. They tend to come from small towns, rural areas, or the modest suburbs immediately ringing the centers of the large cities. They tend to enter the public, urban colleges. The following description of the backgrounds of the University of Minnesota students on its metropolitan campuses is typical.

A majority of students are "first generation" students, that is, most of them have parents who have graduated from high school but not attended college. Approximately two-thirds of the students come from homes where neither parent has had much, if any, college experience. Almost one-fifth of the men entering the University have fathers with no more than eighth grade educations. A high proportion of the students come from homes where the parents are in skilled trades, semi-skilled trades, unskilled occupations, or industrial and production jobs.²

Vocational students share their parents' religion, which is often Roman Catholic or the more fundamentalist and evangelical Protestant. Politically, they are conservative.

Vocational students tend to appear more often than other

²Keith McFarland (ed.), Urbanization and the College Student (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1966), p. 13.

students in the "stereopath" category of social psychological research, generally meaning a kind of person who is unquestioning of authority, untheoretically inclined in thought, unimpulsively inclined in feeling, academically disinterested in the humanities, arts, and social sciences, and concerned for details, routines, and material things to a great degree.³ A person who so narrowly marshalls his energies, no matter how heavily he invests them in hard work on some specialty, is obviously difficult to induce into a liberal education.

A major reason for the failure of some students to respond favorably to a program of general or liberal education has been their obsession with "practical" goals. They are so intent in getting on in the world, that they have no values for learning as such. They are interested only in training which will advance specific vocational or other utilitarian objectives, not in discovering truth about themselves and the universe around them. In the judgment of some psychiatric authorities this type of "pragmatic" as against "ideistic" orientation has its roots in personality structure.⁴

A low level of intelligence does not especially characterize the vocational student subculture. To the contrary, average and better than average intelligence is characteristically combined with a very high level of aspiration. The instrumental jobs toward which they tend may require a long period of training (medicine, dentistry, pharmacy), rigorously demanding and detailed skills and techniques (accounting, engineering), or eventually weighty executive responsi-

³Hall T. Sprague (ed.), Research on College Students (Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1966), p. 13.

⁴Philip Jacob, Changing Values in College (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 118.

bilities (law, business administration).⁵ The vocational students who train for less demanding and curricularly lengthy jobs (elementary education, X-ray technology, electronics, dietetics, and the like) may still be highly aspiring relative to their own starting points. Indeed, a high interest in success--defined in terms of a good job, high income, and improved social position--runs through the vocational student subculture. Also, there is some evidence that on a national scale vocationally-oriented students are more likely to succeed in college both from a psychological and an academic point of view.⁶

The students rated as most "success-oriented" are more likely to maintain an initially high opinion of the values of vocational education in college, or else to learn to value it highly as they go through school. Students rated as "least-success-oriented" show, in contrast, a greater tendency to stick to an initially low evaluation of vocational aims, or else learn to attach little importance to these aims as they move from underclassmen to upperclassmen.⁷

In the Goldsen study many vocational students were found who could not imagine what their actual work would be from day to day, but most held vivid images of the private pleasures enabled by their expected income. Not only do the vocational students use the college instrumentally to secure their jobs but some apparently intend to use their jobs instrumentally to secure their private pleasures.

The percentage of students in contemporary colleges who hold

⁵Sprague, op. cit., p. 73.

⁶Nevitt Sanford (ed.), The American College (New York: Wiley and Sons, 1962), p. 603.

⁷Rose Goldsen, et al., What College Students Think (Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1960), p. 21.

the vocational orientation foremost is, of course, difficult to measure. In his Great Aspirations, James Davis found 32 per cent of 33,982 June, 1961, graduates of 135 colleges perceiving the primary purpose of college to be vocational training.⁸ Philip Jacob's Changing Values in College of ten years ago summed up the majority of college students in a vocational way, although not in the more stringent terms Clark and Trow speak of vocational students. Since the "Jacob Report" was widely read outside research circles, even educational circles, it shocked some who assumed colleges were liberalizing influences upon the young. It may be the colleges are, but it is difficult to measure the influences of the colleges on the liberalization of student values. The weight of the vocational attitudes and actions in American higher education may not mean that the colleges are not trying to do their jobs of liberal education in and out of class, but doing it against greater odds than before and showing little for it in the mass.

Even if we take a frankly sociological view of the matter and attempt to understand these seeming changes in the value orientations of university students as reflections of the populations from which they are recruited, from this view we know that college has not only increased numerically but has increasingly attracted segments of our population with different "life expectancies" from those to which the more traditional liberal arts curriculum was originally attuned. We are dealing here with a population change rather than value change.⁹

⁸James Davis, Great Aspirations (Chicago: Aldine, 1964), p. 32.

⁹McFarland, op. cit., p. 23.

As higher education becomes as common as secondary education, the influence of the values of college graduates upon society will depend less upon radical values changes among a few students and more upon the amassed, slight value changes of all the students. Some change is visible since the "Jacob Report," but that remains to be discussed in the chapters on the academic and nonconformist student subcultures.

III. A THEOLOGICAL VIEW OF THE DOMINANT CONCERNS OF VOCATIONAL STUDENTS

Social Mobility and Justification. For the vocational student the college now functions as the frontier and free soil, running away to the sea, or entering the army once functioned to advance the status of one from the lower classes. Indeed, the college may function even more precisely like entering the priesthood of the medieval church functioned to advance the status of one from the lower classes, for as the clerics "administered the grace" of the church so are the benefits of a deified technology administered by clerks. Upward social mobility through technology is a dominant concern of the vocational student and may express a self-justifying spiritual condition.

Students are invading high schools and colleges from population strata that had formerly not experienced secondary and higher education. As the university gates are stormed by a host of new students, and as the preparation track for technical and elite positions become longer, the nature and consciousness of class divisions are undergoing a major shift. The majorities were once outside the university system; they now have moved into it. This does not mean that they are all becoming members of the elites, but that they have a chance to.¹⁰

¹⁰Sprague, op. cit., p. 13.

There is nothing intrinsically wrong with anyone wishing and working to improve the conditions and level of his material and social life with the means his society provides. The bother of it is that such striving--and succeeding and failing--is often valued as a register of moral and human worth. The greatest sin the vocational student can imagine is the sin of standing still, of not rising and registering.

A Christian judgment of this dominant concern of the vocational student subculture is not one for students alone but for American society generally. Being so minimally committed to ideas and minimally involved in the life of the college, the vocational student subculture is most continuous with American society. It participates deeply in an achievement culture where failure or disinterest in success is not simply accepted or possibly pitied but often judged to be cowardly, lazy, weak, and morally unworthy if not an insult to the national economy. Part of the reason the vocational student tends to enjoy less psychological stress than his peers may be due to the fact that his values merge so closely with the prevailing values of his society. With the exception of occasionally shuffling off some manual, working class values of his parents--but in order to achieve their hopes--he is the least alienated of students from society.

A Christian judgment of the work righteousness of the achievement culture with which the vocational student subculture is closely identified needs to be specified in the ministry of the church to the students. It finds its words evangelically short of advocating withdrawal from society, a course of action taken by some nonconformist

students which can be as self-justifying in intention as may be further participation in an achievement culture. But within the dialectics of being in but not of the world, a Christian understanding of existence aroused by the gospel, some of the greatest temptations to equate upward social mobility with personal worth and the making of a just man can be recognized and resisted. On the strength of the conviction that personal worth is given by a God who is no respecter of persons and is received by a faith which is no human achievement, one broadens the range of his choices for his work, is free to find the meaning in any work, importantly including the work of the college years for their own sakes, and can take up work which advances the welfare of the neighbor if not one's own status in society.

Technical Skills and Stewardship. Technical skills are highly valued by the vocational student, whether they be the simple skills of a dental assistant mixing the metals for a filling or the complex skills of a mechanical engineer computing the strengths of the metals for a bridge. To have a skill is to have something of value, like property or capital, to put to work in the commonwealth.

While the commonwealth may be able to view vocational students interchangeably, the church may not. Opposed in its effects to liberal education which tends to differentiate individuals, training in skills tends to process individuals so they can work in concert in prescribed ways and can be replaced by others similarly trained without loss of efficiency. The church views the vocational student as a person of infinite worth by the grace of God. His vocational skills do not

measure his personal worth, for they are gifts given him for stewardship.

The counsel of the church regarding the stewardship of technical skills in the contemporary period is a ministry of great urgency. Skills are difficult to ideologize successfully--being instrumental in the service of something else and unable to answer ultimate questions about life's meaning--although the attempt is continually made to ideologize them. Skills are made gods and alleged to be able to grant 100,000 dollars and more to a person in his lifetime income than would be his lot if he had not gone to college to "learn today, earn tomorrow." It is becoming clearer that the learning of new skills and the unlearning of obsolete skills throughout a lifetime of work makes those learned in college more relative.

"Continuing" education, retraining, and refresher courses symbolize the acknowledged fact that for many of us the formal period of learning cannot easily come to a full stop, to be followed by a long stretch of "adult" performance. In order to be continuous, learning, now associated with youth, will have to become compatible with adulthood, and, in a society committed to sustained technical change, it must be continuous.¹¹

The ministry of the church has yet much work to do with all ages in the evangelical turning of skills from gods to serve to gifts to celebrate. The development of a larger and larger body of men and women with advanced skills and a general disinterest in the ends they serve, save earning their income, is the mischief the vocational student works upon the world. The ministry of the church must stress

¹¹Erik Erikson (ed.), The Challenge of Youth (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1965), p. 69.

the human ends for which each man's talents are divinely claimed and the responsibility for them with which he is charged and held accountable.

Employment and Vocation. The use of the term "vocational" to describe the students under consideration in this chapter is to use Clark and Trow's term and that of other researchers into college student populations. That term does not, however, carry the same associations of meaning the term "vocation" has in the Christian tradition, especially within Protestantism. From the point of view of the latter, it would be more accurate to describe these students as employment or job oriented rather than vocational. A Christian judgment would wish to discriminate between what one does to earn his living and how he follows when called into a special kind of life. God's calling which is the gospel of the forgiveness of sins and a Christian's calling which is the form his whole life takes around that grace need to be distinguished from his work as a student and his prospective employment.¹² Such a distinction needs to be made in such a way that the student's work in college and his work on the job become occasions of the divine vocation of the Christian man.

A great change in the occupational structure during the last hundred years and longer makes the United States today a nation of

¹²Einar Billing, "Our Calling" (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), p. 1 et seqq.

employees.¹³ According to the last census, 87 per cent of the labor force works for other people. In the first phase of the change, a change from an agriculturally based economy to an industrially based economy occurred. Forty per cent of the labor force were agriculturally self-employed in 1870, but less than 7 per cent are now so employed. The changing skills required to make and market an increasing number of new industrial products makes the employment situation very fluid. In the second phase of the change, and more important for the contemporary college student, is the approaching end of the industrial revolution. Marshall McLuhan writes:

"Jobs" represent a relatively recent pattern of work. From the fifteenth century to the twentieth century, there is a steady progress of fragmentation of the stages of work that constitute "mechanization" and "specialism." These procedures cannot serve for survival or sanity in this new time. Under conditions of electric circuitry, all the fragmented job patterns tend to blend once more into involving and demanding roles or forms of work that more and more resemble teaching, learning, and "human" service, in the older sense of dedicated loyalty.¹⁴

As the machine greatly curtailed the agricultural labor force, so now it is the expectation, already partly realized, that automated machinery will greatly curtail the mechanical labor force. Already, within the last half century, the industrial labor forces have declined in percentage and the service labor force has increased. In 1910, only

¹³The writer is statistically informed in this paragraph by a chapter, "College Education and Vocational Career," in Wilbur Brookover, et al., The College Student (New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1965), pp. 100-16.

¹⁴Marshall McLuhan, The Medium is the Massage (New York: Bantam, 1967), p. 20.

about 36 per cent of the labor force were engaged in service occupations; presently as many as 56 per cent are so employed. It is presently estimated that 60 per cent of the labor force is engaged in middle-class occupations--management, personnel, the professions, sales, and information exchanging services of all kinds--requiring more and more education at higher and higher levels.

The vocational student is shrewd to see the necessity of a college degree in his plans to participate in a nation of employees. Perhaps for some service labor short of the professions it may reasonably be asked whether a college degree is a necessity, but it cannot be denied it is now almost a general requirement. What the vocational student may not be shrewd enough to see is the limitations of a strictly vocational training for lifetime employability. The flexibility, imagination, and creativity a man will need to gather his wits and retrain himself many times in his employed lifetime--not to mention use his increasing leisure and goods and discharge his more and more complex citizenship--are not fostered in strict vocational training.

The task does not, however, peculiarly fall to the ministry of the church therefore to seek to divert vocational students to the liberal arts and humanities. There are indeed excellent reasons to advance the liberal arts, to seek to delay vocational and professional specialization to the years of graduate study and internships, and to encourage more and more interdisciplinary studies and the humanities in American colleges, and churchmen may join forces with others who take such actions. The church may even wish to seek to countervail

the financial pressures favoring vocationalism presently exerted by the federal government, business, and industry by making more of its financial resources available for scholarships in the humanities and for new and serious support of its many liberal arts colleges. These and other encouragements of the liberal arts may be wisely given, but not as the peculiar ministry of the church to higher education, let alone the vocational student subculture.

A Christian ministry of the proclamation of the divine call and the formation of Christian vocation does not relate to the liberal arts in any way superior to its relation to vocational training. On evangelical grounds, the liberal arts and vocational tracks of higher education may not be judged the superior and inferior tracks.

Newman has done a great deal to mislead us over this. His notion of liberal education is curiously ambivalent, owing more to the Oxonian and English notions of the gentlemen, themselves based on classical ideas, than to distinctively Christian insight or to academic history. Christianity has always laid great emphasis, in one way or another, upon the importance of vocation and would not think of it simply in mundane terms. . . . It is one of the great insights of the Bible that men find meaning and direction for their lives in a personal call . . . , when men say, in Luther's phrase, that the primary sphere of men's obedience to God is in their activity in the secular world. Francis Bacon, the scientifically-minded Calvinist, was more representative in this matter than Newman, the Oxford Romantic. The truth is that the nineteenth-century notion of liberal education as being appropriate to a gentleman, and the related notion of the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, was, for all its classical inspiration, a modern one.¹⁵

The image of the college favoring the liberal arts which one sees in classical statements regarding the relationship of Christian faith and

¹⁵Daniel Jenkins, The Educated Society (London: Faber and Faber, 1966), p. 129.

higher education is not the whole Christian judgment of that issue, although colleges and churches will continue to profit from study of such an image whenever they seek anew to find themselves and their relationship.¹⁶ What also needs a Christian judgment in higher education is vocational education as it seeks to find itself.

Ministers and theologians, themselves mostly educated in the liberal arts and humanities, have tended toward relating Christian faith to a core of humanities rather than to a chaos of applied sciences and technologies. To the question "whether God might not be using science to bring to an end a world characterized by liberal arts culture not because that culture is bad, but because it is anachronistic,"¹⁷ many would reply, "Oh God, no!" A. John Coleman has observed that the student Christian movement makes no progress among technical students and, for all its vaunted worldliness, holds itself together as an arts and seminary students' group with "a common interest in discussing philosophical, theological, and social questions."¹⁸ In some colleges a student must be fairly "Tweedy" to associate with the Christians. The close association between the

¹⁶Some "classical statements" are John Henry Newman, The Idea of a University (New York: Doubleday, 1959); Walter Moberly, The Crisis in the University (London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1949); Arnold Nash, The University and the Modern World (New York: Macmillan, 1943); and possibly Alexander Miller, Faith and Learning (New York: Association Press, 1960).

¹⁷George Earnshaw (ed.), The Campus Ministry (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1964), p. 130.

¹⁸A. John Coleman, The Task of the Christian in the University (New York: Association Press, 1947), p. 88.

liberal arts and humanities and the ministry of the church is valid but not to the exclusion of as close an association between it and the applied sciences and technologies. A student of the latter ought not be tempted to think of the Christian faith as something of a hobby or adornment.

The vocational student needs to be evangelically encouraged to think of both his present vocational training and his prospective job as important occasions of his Christian vocation. At the same time, the ministry of the church needs to think of his vocational training and his eventual employment as important for the occasions of his Christian vocation as his general cultivation. A contemporary Christian ministry may not simply favor the civilizing of human beings first and their service of the economic machine second but rather those words and deeds which place a Christian understanding of vocation first and relate both vocational training and liberal education to it together.

CHAPTER V

THE ACADEMIC STUDENT SUBCULTURE

II. BIOGRAPHICAL GLIMPSE OF ACADEMIC STUDENT

Paul Knight looks up from the editorial he is writing and somewhat vacantly out of the window to see the sky brightening. It has been another all-nighter for him as editor of the college paper. His desk is littered with crumpled yellow sheets, two full ashtrays, and empty paper coffee cups. The rest of the staff left around one o'clock, and he is alone. The lay-out is done, with only the space left for his editorial.

Paul has written more editorials this year by sunrises than he cares to remember, but this one is harder than usual to write. It is urging several major curricular reforms of the college, has been well researched and reflected, but is hard to put down in words which will arouse administrative action rather than anger. He has come to love his college too much to criticize it in a way it cannot help itself, but he is also too much committed to scholarship to feel satisfied with the curriculum as it stands and as he has stood it. And so with each well documented criticism he is careful to make a well reasoned constructive proposal. It is politic and pointed and will please both his professors and his peers.

This kind of care runs through all Paul's work. He will graduate with honors this June, received a Woodrow Wilson identification last week, and has already received attractive entrance fellowships at

three graduate schools. Having taken two majors in college, one in history and one in philosophy, he has decided to go on in history in graduate school. He has come to like both the life of scholarship and the life of the college that he looks forward to college teaching as a career. This pleases his father, a small city newspaper editor, who has boosted Paul in all his studies and has liberally supported his higher education financially, often at some sacrifice to himself of which Paul is not unaware. Sometimes he borrows heavily from his son's editorials for ideas for his own, and he recognizes the superiority of his son's education over his own. Sometimes he wishes Paul had more business sense or would be more interested in the publishing business.

Besides work on the college paper all his college career, consummated in his senior editorship, Paul has been involved in a few other carefully chosen college activities. His one mistake, as he sees it, was his two years in a fraternity, from which he has gone inactive. It simply took too much time on trivia. He has much more enjoyed his music, playing oboe, by default of any other comers he quips, in the college orchestra, and his senior year chairmanship of the honor council charged with trying cases of student cheating.

Paul attends a small, prestigious, liberal arts college, and there seems to be an increase in cheating as the academic standards, at least for the grade point average, go up. Paul is able to get very high marks without cheating, but only by long hours of study, increasingly severe restrictions on his social life and sleep, and going to summer school, too. He so highly regards academic work that cheating would go against his own grain, but he does admit that competition with

his fellow students make it thinkable. A good deal depends on grades--military service deferment, graduate school admission, present scholarships and future fellowships, honors like Phi Beta Kappa, and eligibility for certain campus activities--that cheating is not at all unthinkable. A friend of Paul's whose self-respect depends on his grades is curiously able at times to cheat to preserve that self-respect. Paul cannot fathom that moral position, save when he realizes that he cannot bring himself to turn in his own friend to his own honor council.

During his freshman summer Paul took both a speed-reading and a speed-writing course which has helped him somewhat to manage the increasing length of his reading lists and his note-taking. His undergraduate honors thesis, submitted last semester to both his major departments on the subject of some philosophical presuppositions of a major historian, was quietly judged superior to most of the master's theses of his examiners. Within the week, the chairmen of both departments called Paul in to encourage him to take up graduate work in their respective fields.

Margot Thomas enters the office with a thermos of fresh coffee. She reads Paul's cramped script over his shoulder, suggests he soften "departmental empire builders whose writing for the last ten years has been wholly on inter-office memos" to something like "academics whose administrative duties have lately seriously limited both their scholarship and classroom teaching," and begins to give Paul a deft neck and back massage. Paul enjoys her feminine touch--both on his editorial and the nape of his neck. Margot has risen early to drive Paul to the printers, not trusting him to be awake enough at the wheel

after one of his all-nighters. They have been engaged since Christmas, went steady since their sophomore year, and will be married the day after graduation. Their dates have been almost always combined with their work--driving dates, study dates, orchestra dates, shopping dates--for there is little time for social life apart from it. Margot, too, wants a career in college teaching of her present major in Russian, and they have laughingly referred to their marriage as a merger of their fellowships. For a wedding gift from her parents, they are summering and honeymooning in Russia. "Our 'book break,'" they call it, "before graduate school."

Margot takes the last sheet of Paul's script to a typewriter and quickly types it up. She knows his handwriting and where it is illegible she supplies the words he should have used. Paul sips some coffee, hot in his cramped fingers around the thin paper cup, and looks over her shoulders as his words appear in dreadful finality. He gathers up the other copy and layouts, his notes on a paper he is preparing on common themes appearing in recent anniversary celebrations of the Reformation and the Russian Revolution, and joins Margo in a slow walk and some sleepy squeezes to the parking lot. He is almost asleep as he piles himself and his papers in the seat beside her, and he is deeply asleep before she drives through the gates of the campus. The sun is rising on a new day on the campus, his light was left burning at his desk, and Paul dreams of reformation and revolution.

II. ORIGINS AND CHARACTER OF ACADEMIC STUDENT SUBCULTURE

The last two student subcultures to be discussed in this paper, the academic and the nonconformist, are recent cultural developments in their strength on American college campuses. When important distinctions are not made between the two subcultures, they are together taken up in phrases like "the new student ferment," "the new breed," "the upbeat generation," and like expressions. While there are many similarities between the two subcultures and many cross-cultural passages made by individuals between them, the important Clark-Trow distinction is observed in this paper. According to it, both are involved in ideas. The academic students are also strongly identified with the college, while the nonconformist students are not at all or not nearly so strongly identified with the college. The former tend to institutionalize their ideational activities, and the latter tend to rebel in the name of their ideational commitments.

It sounds strange or even haughty to say that the academic student, both highly committed to ideas and his college, is a recent cultural development. Certainly many students throughout the whole history of American higher education have been so doubly committed. However, what is new about the academic student subculture is in part its increasing size on many campuses, increasingly cutting into the collegiate subculture, and in part the new ideas and especially the preprofessional aspects of the colleges to which they are deeply committed. As this development is examined below, it is to be remembered that the work of the churches has hitherto often been so

enmeshed in the collegiate subculture that it is itself experiencing this subcultural change in emphasis.

Campus organizations and activities, including religious organizations, have had their day of prominence. The glory that these activities used to bring to some individuals, which was regarded as a mark of "leadership" is now viewed as bothersome and trivial. A new pattern of life has emerged on the campus, and to understand this may help interpret the general decline in religious groups and activities.¹

The growth of the academic student subculture is favorably influenced by many recent cultural forces, chief among them the following: (1) sufficient affluence permitting longer periods of time in higher education, especially in graduate school for the academic students; (2) an increasingly complex, technological society requiring specialization and expertness not only among its clerks but among its creators and leaders; (3) the waging of a "cold war" between two highly rationalized societies in terms of a "balance of terror" since World War II and a "space race" since Sputnik I of highly sophisticated nuclear weaponry and rocketry; (4) the ascendancy of basic research in the universities, especially well funded in the natural sciences, and a "knowledge explosion" in all areas of inquiry; (5) a "knowledge implosion" of different peoples and cultures, especially the emerging "third world," upon one another by means of greatly accelerated communications and travel; (6) the ascendancy of the United States to a position of free world leadership abroad and its increasingly complex and dangerous internal social and economic

¹George Earnshaw (ed.), The Campus Ministry (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1964), p. 282.

problems requiring study and action; (7) the growth of new service professions (one example, regarding the academic student very directly, is the fact that in 1954 there were already more people teaching in colleges than were enrolled in 1900)² and the specialization of older professions into finer and finer fields; (8) the bureaucritization of society, including its educational institutions at all levels, and the necessity to "test well" in many objective, impersonal ways to take part in it; (9) the very slight but evident new respect many Americans have recently given intellectuals in public life and the similarly slight but evident new interest of Americans in using their leisure and prosperity for arts and entertainments of a more sophisticated character; and (10) the general movement of the American love of the frontier from the land to the mind.

The last two decades have seen a shift from a strong social view of higher education to an increasingly academic and preprofessional and professional view. Death notices for "Joe College" are greatly exaggerated, but he is in some retreat everywhere. In some respects, the collegiate style of life is also now more prevalent in the high schools, and perhaps there it is left behind.

Homecoming, big weekends, floats, proms--these things are out. Students are thinking of that sort of thing now as high school stuff. (I heard this again and again from students on this and other campuses, sometimes with the key term being "junior high school stuff.")³

²Wilbur Brookover, et al., The College Student (New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1965), p. 101.

³David Mallery, Ferment on the Campus (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), p. 85.

The first blow to collegiate life was struck by the return of the World War II veterans to the colleges in the late forties. While their earnestness about their studies was probably more vocational than academic in the main, they did bring a new seriousness over the campuses. Married men, often fathers, who had fought a great war were not attracted to the frivolous and nonsensical aspects of collegiate life. They could scarcely be hazed, induced into poking crepe paper into chicken wire to build homecoming floats, or live idly and expensively on their "G.I. Bill" payments. Student life under their influences became a more earnest, if not largely a more academic, business.

A second blow to collegiate life was struck in the launching of Sputnik I in the late fifties. The wound inflicted upon American pride by such an achievement of the Soviet Union moved the general public, government officials, and educators to bear down on American students, particularly in their mathematics and science studies. The many questions asked why Ivan could do what Johnny could not--read, spell, write, and compute--led to reforms in elementary and secondary education which were destined to trickle upward. Sputnik I is a symbol not simply of an international competition of brain power but also a symbol of a technological age in which competition at home, too, is one of brain power.

A third blow struck in favor of the academic student was an effect of the greatly increasing number of college students in recent years. From the time of the return of the veterans to the campuses in the late forties through the time when their sons and daughters hit the campuses in boom numbers in the early sixties to the present time and

probably until 1980, colleges were, are, and will be well supplied with applicants for admission.

The postwar baby boom foretells that the remaining years of this decade and most of the 1970's will go down in history as the period of the college enrollment explosion. During the fourteen-year period, 1946-1959, a total of 55 million babies were born in this country, in contrast to only 36 million during the preceding fourteen-year period. The recently rising trends in college enrollment have been small ripples in comparison to the tidal wave that will roll from now until about 1980. The rapidly increasing college-age population will be accentuated by at least two socioeducational phenomena. One is the ever increasing proportion of persons of nearly all ages pursuing higher education; the other is the gradual rise in the educational level of adults. Educated parents tend to have high educational expectations of their children.⁴

In round figures there are presently nearly 6.5 million students in higher education, 4.25 in public schools, and 2.25 in private schools. Four million are men and 2.5 million are women. Almost one million are in junior colleges. Nearly 1.5 million of 2.75 million high school graduates entered some institution of higher education in 1967, and a half million students received baccalaureate degrees in the same year. In 1967 half of the 200 million people of the United States were under twenty-five years of age, that is, in age groups where elementary, secondary, college, and early graduate work is typically taken up.⁵

The extraordinary growth in numbers of students in higher education could be reasonably feared as a watering of the stock, a dilution of academic concerns. Yet it is at the same time of growth in numbers of students there has also occurred a growth in qualities

⁴Brookover, op. cit., p. 19.

⁵Ibid.

favoring academic concerns. Among some reasons adduced for this qualitative growth which consider the concomitant quantitative growth are the following: (1) parents who earned the baccalaureate degree in the last generation tend to make graduate degrees necessary for their children, either by reason of direct parental exhortation or by reason of their children's need to differentiate themselves from their parents, thus making graduate school admissibility a task of the undergraduate years; (2) the approaching devaluation of the baccalaureate degree to the present status of a high school diploma as more and more people earn baccalaureate degrees, hence again making graduate school admissibility a task of the undergraduate years for those who would distinguish themselves; (3) the stiffening competition for college entrance affects many more high school students than there are now places in the best colleges for them all to win, thus bringing to average colleges, too, a highly motivated and well prepared group of students often abler to learn than the faculty is to teach; (4) the very increase of the numbers of college students drew attention to the colleges in the ways large numbers attract American attention and involved more citizens, parents, legislators, and the mass media in college problems than had hitherto been the case, thus increasing support for higher education in all its aspects, its quality as well as its quantity; and (5) many educators themselves were so fearful for the mediocrity which might accompany such growth in numbers that they took special pains to enrich as well as enlarge their services, thus increasing honors programs, independent study and tutorials, study abroad, accelerated courses, inter-institutional co-operation in the

use of strategic materials and personnel, and experimental colleges, experimentation with college facilities, calendars, and curricula in search of academic depth for gifted students as well as the means to meet the minimum needs of all college students. The increasing number of college students has not had a diluting effect upon higher education and very possibly has given some impetus to its academic concerns.

The academic student today has both more pressures upon him and opportunities open to him than he had when there were fewer students. The distinctive aspect of the academic student subculture is that within it students accept the pressures for the sake of the opportunities. In this subculture in which so much of what educators desire for college students is accepted, the best and worst of contemporary higher education is seen in the students themselves.

[Talcott] Parsons contends the standards of educational achievement have been raised considerably; the quantity of material is greater, and the quality of educational content is higher. Parsons feels the willingness of youth to accept these higher standards indicates their full acceptance of the major cultural theme of American society, institutionalized activism.⁵

The academically committed students tend to be the children of professional people--teachers, doctors, lawyers, clergymen, public officials, and business men. They are children reared with the advantages of postwar American affluence in a period of relatively uninterrupted peace. The majority of academic students are white, upper-middle-class suburban youth who come to college with the backing of

⁵David Gottlieb and Charles Ramsey, The American Adolescent (Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1964), p. 106.

good high schools and summer camps, music lessons and dancing classes, well fitted wardrobes and allowances, the experience of travel and television, verbal and sometimes precocious social sophistication, and good health. They tend to enter the smaller, private, and prestigious colleges of liberal arts, but they are also strongly represented in the large public universities, especially in the humanities and natural and social sciences divisions.

These sons and daughters of professional people are themselves preprofessional in their approach to college. They are preparing to repeat the outward patterns of life of their parents. Unlike the vocational student, the academic student is not attempting to change his station in life. His past usually gives him little poverty to escape from, little anxiety about income and getting a job, and little need for social mobility. He is usually asking for more of the same suburban living and aspiring to do professionally what his father did. There is not among many academic students a burning desire to succeed financially, but they are very interested in being "good in their fields." They know that simply to do what their parents have done professionally now requires a greater academic effort and scholarly mastery than their parents had to put forth and achieve in the seemingly simpler times of the thirties and forties.

In the present period of rapid social change, one must run very fast to stand his ground. For the academic student, this means an early start, early specialization, a scrupulous concentration of his efforts in his studies to the exclusion of many other activities, more years at his studies, and precious little time for experimentation or

mistakes. For the academic student, the "moratorium" on adulthood is foreshortened even as his years in school are lengthened. The school years are themselves "for keeps." He has promises to himself and to his diverse patrons and promoters to keep and, to complete the verse, miles to go before he sleeps.

College attendance has become an integral part of the American way of life. The national purpose and college attendance coincide. An individual of above-average intelligence who chooses not to go to college may not be morally reprehensible, but he is certainly no patriot. Students are encouraged to work harder and harder at earlier and earlier stages to absorb the knowledge of various disciplines and to prepare for college where they will work harder still.

.....

Demands for earlier and earlier professional commitment have also intensified. Programs such as summer workshops supported by government agencies and private foundations have helped this process. The faculties of various departments compete for the best students, whom they attempt to recruit as early as possible and to mold in the prevailing images of their respective fields. Despite obeisance to liberal education in catalogues and public pronouncements and the presence of interdisciplinary courses in the curriculum, the prominent colleges have become, since World War II, more and more exclusively training grounds for graduate and professional schools.⁶

At the same time academic students vigorously pursue their studies they also participate in the life of the college, especially those activities the faculty most approves. Many have a high nurturance component in their personalities which makes them willing to give some of their time and energies to taking care of campus housekeeping chores and looking after their friends. Their own studies and the

⁶Mervin Freedman, The College Experience (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967), pp. 13-14.

affairs of the campus tend to circumscribe their working world. "After looking after their own interests . . . and keeping the campus tidy," writes Esther Lloyd-Jones, "they are willing to leave Viet Nam and China to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense."⁷

There is among the academic students much of the spirit of the so-called "liberal establishment" of America from whence they come and whither they go. Their commitments both to academic achievement and the social system and personnel of the college usually means a high respect given to planning, channels, consensus, gradualism in reforms, institution building and maintenance, and government by expertise with a healthy respect for the needs of minorities. They tend to cover their risks carefully, be schedule oriented, and be especially able to delay present gratifications for future rewards. When Dora Damrin, counselor for the James Scholars at the University of Illinois, was asked about the backgrounds and personal styles of her students, she gave a reply typical of the academic student generally.

He is a veritable paragon of academic virtue. He is conscientious, interested, docile, well adjusted, well mannered. He studies hard--regardless of the assignment and regardless of his interest in it. His papers are neat and handed in on time. He thoroughly enjoys his high school work. He participates heavily in the extracurricular program of the school. In short he is a joy to his high school teachers and later will become a joy to his college professors. He has accepted and internalized our values and our standards--he performs as we wish him to

⁷Esther Lloyd-Jones (ed.), The American Student and His College (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1967), p. 40.

perform--and from us he receives our accolade of merit, the Golden A. It is practically impossible for this student to fail.⁸

On the same campus the same interviewer gathered vivid descriptions of academic students from sociologist Joseph Gusfield. He referred to them as "climbing, career obsessed" students beholding the grade point system as a "system of infant damnation" and bringing a "creeping asceticism" and "meritocracy" over the campus.⁹

Such colorful language points up the vocational aspect of the academic student subculture, namely that a student may be nearly as vocationally oriented if he is preparing himself for graduate school and a career in the "knowledge industry" as he would be if he were preparing for business or engineering. Such language also points up the academic student's high concern for grades. The collegiate student invented the "Gentleman's C." The vocational student is concerned for grades but tends to be more concerned for his degree attained at whatever level of achievement, believing that few employers, unlike all graduate schools, look at actual transcripts. The nonconformist student either could not "care less" or is even contemptuous of the grading "system" whether he does brilliantly, drops out for a while, or does token and erratic work for grades. The academic student, however, tends to accept the grading system, certainly not without some griping, as a serious measure not only of his standing in competition with his

⁸Nicholas von Hoffman, The Multiversity (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966), p. 101.

⁹Ibid., p. 128.

fellow students but also as a measure of his intellectual life and his personal worth. The academic student's involvement with ideas and intellectual excellence is mixed with his commitment to the college and often issues in an anxious concern for grades. The latter are not always a good measure of the former and tend to reward good memories, docility, and grinding.

In effect, the students know full well that Type A (the abstract standards of excellence) recognition does not necessarily bring the tangible results of Type B (the comparative standard of excellence). A 99th percentile rating on a national ranking can be more helpful to a student than a professor's opinion that "here is a good mind." We can paraphrase students' reluctance to enter segregated groups: "Why risk my scholarship (or acceptance to medical school, or Phi Beta Kappa key, or Selective Service deferment, or GI benefits, or fellowship, or social prestige), by taking an enriched course, and possibly failing it or coming out second best, when I am sure of the highest grade in the regular course?" In the jargon of the guidance field we may label such students underachievers; in the dog-eat-dog competitive field we would call them realistic.¹⁰

The academic student by his commitments both to ideas and the college becomes most subject to the way the college metes out ideas and rewards their manipulation. He is the most socialized of students into American higher education. He has "gone native" to a greater degree than any other type of student discussed in this paper. The collegiate students tend to "colonize" on the campus, drawing on its life but investing the minimum in its work. The vocational students tend to "visit" the campus (many are literally commuters), finding it a nice place to learn skills "but one wouldn't want to live there." The nonconformist students tend to be "revolutionaries" outside the

¹⁰Lloyd-Jones, op. cit., p. 124.

orders of the college but within its borders. The academic student in his primary groupings and personal styles, therefore, embodies more of the tensions of contemporary higher education. Some current tensions are difficult to contain in one system or person. There is the increased selectivity of colleges at the same time that college admission is an increasing expectation of more young people and their parents. There is the emphasis placed upon high school grades and standardized tests for college admission (and upon college grades and similar tests for graduate school admission) at the same time such grades and tests are seen to be unrelated to other kinds of personally and socially important performance. There is the pressure on students for grades which is not unrelated to the prevalence of cheating. The emphasis given abstract verbal learning, the aroused competition with fellow students, the increasing retreat of the researching "faculty in absentia" from teaching, and the demands for greater rates of reading and writing speed are not unrelated to student emotional distress, loneliness, and frustration.¹¹

It may be said here briefly, to be amplified in the next chapter, that the origin of the nonconformist student is often the academic student who bursts tensions like those above and others, dropping or greatly reducing his commitments to the college in the name of his commitment to ideas and urgent campus and off-campus activities. Part of what the nonconformist does not conform to is the college. The

¹¹The Student in Higher Education (Washington: American Council on Education, 1965), pp. 104-105.

"proletariat" of the nonconformists, that group of people whose very social conditions drive them toward reform, is not the collegiate or vocational but the academic student subculture.

III. A THEOLOGICAL VIEW OF THREE DOMINANT CONCERNS OF ACADEMIC STUDENTS

Grades and Grace. The intense concern of academic students for grades must be understood as a many-sided interest in many things grades represent to them. However inadequately, grades do represent a certain level of mastery of a subject matter and also something of a measure of intellectual achievement. There are better, more personal and individual, ways for a student to get "feedback" on his academic and intellectual life, but grades are one way. In one sense, the oldest student typology is the grading system.

Grading is a selecting device rather than an educational one. But its persistence is due to its having social utility. It is a good democratic instrument for classifying people in an impersonal manner and allowing for upward mobility and re-shuffling of the elites by giving high performers access to the more prestigious schools and from there, to positions of leadership.¹²

The weakness of grades as measures of academic and intellectual life, however, is compounded when they also come to represent many other things having little to do with academic and intellectual life. As mentioned above, grades may represent to students their scholarships, fellowships, eligibility for certain college activities and

¹²Lawrence Dennis and Joseph Kauffman (eds.), The College and the Student (Washington: American Council on Education, 1966), p. 139.

honorary societies, graduate school admissions, draft deferments, social prestige, and even parental approval. Grades are, in a sense, the currency of the academic student. Good grades pay off in several ways extrinsic to learning proper and can confuse proper learning.

The formation of a Christian judgment of the high interest of the academic student in grades ought include a judgment of his tempters and exploiters. Ultimately, the ministry of the church seeks to declare and specify for students the evangelical existence possible for them when the grace of God given for accounting personal worth is accepted in faith and their grades are not accepted as a substitute. However, the ministry of the church will also be involved in frequently prior questions of the simple equity of the grading system and the prudence of attaching so many riders to it. For example, the church in its concern for justice might well have been more moved to protest the practical attachment of the Selective Service System to the grading system tried three years ago. (With respect to its ministry to non-conformist students it might be more moved to question the reclassification of students involved in war protests on the grounds of the constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and the separation of juridical and military powers.) The church does not only come to the defense of the college against the state, although such a defense may be an increasingly necessary role, but also questions the college about the equity and prudence of the grading system itself. Course units, credit and quality points, averages, A-B-C's and the general quantifying of what are ostensibly developing qualities of the mind and the faculty-student relationship of teaching and learning need a fresh

examination. Learning is not grace, but neither is it consumer goods. As the church no longer measures out merits and indulgences, so also is the college to be helped into its own reformation.

A Christian judgment, however, moves beyond the judgment and assisted reforms of systems in its formation. There is also a ministry to persons who must live within imperfect systems during the reforms, girded with the evangelical derivation that here we have no continuing college but seek one to come. Here it is that the academic student must often be delivered from the idolatry of placing his personal worth in grades rather than grace.

Such idolatry occurs to academic students at both ends of the grading scale. There is the bright but forlorn "underachiever," who in his over-acceptance of the grading system feels he is worthless when he grades low.

Once this feeling develops, its common consequences are depression, confusion, increasing but futile efforts to study harder, and a mounting sense of disaster which may eventually reach panic proportions. Many students who fit this type do not actually drop out of college, but if they remain, they do so with a self-confirming suspicion that they are not so good as they hoped, that they are not really first rate. They almost always blame themselves, not college or society; indeed, they generally lack enough critical detachment from the colleges they attend to be able to criticize them at all.¹³

These students find it most difficult to relate their own search for personal meaning and worth to the continual pressures of their college lives. Their close identification with the college makes them almost unable to elaborate a valued self when they grade low. Grading "low"

¹³Robert Morison (ed.), The Contemporary University: U.S.A. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966), p. 340.

can mean average marks for these students. The fact that academic grades predict academic grades, with no demonstrable relationship to anything else--

not creativity, not inventiveness, not leadership, not good citizenship, not compassion, not aesthetic sensitivity, not expressive talent in many of the performing arts, not personal and social maturity, not mental health, not vocational success, not family happiness, not honest workmanship¹⁴--

is lost to them. The Christian ministry here must be that preaching, counseling, and fellowship which announces, embodies, and confirms in community the grace of God in which ultimate personal meaning is given to faith and around which the works of grades take on their relative meaning.

There is also the bright and almost equally forlorn academic student who grades high and yet feels worthless. He may appear as often as the student given to false pride in the same situation. When he appears, he is nearly a straight A student who yet feels he is not doing very well. He accepts the grading system, values A's highly, but does not feel satisfied when he earns them. Instead he feels like he is just getting by, and that there is so much more he should be doing. A temptation of the ministry, of course, is to look only for subtle forms of pride or to draw the student quickly to the objective standard of achievement and to the fact that his teachers judge his work to be the best being done in their classes and have graded him with all they can give. There may indeed be "so much more he should be doing," although it often has nothing to do with more academic work.

¹⁴The Student in Higher Education, p. 106.

And indeed an academic student may be ascetically more eager to set higher and higher standards for himself than to believe and celebrate his real achievements. But the ministry of the church is the same to those in the heights of academic achievement as to those in the depths, and the reference of the ministering word and deed is again to the grace of God in which is ultimate personal meaning. Neither depths nor heights, neither despair nor compulsiveness, can separate a student from the love of God, and grades can neither justify nor condemn the person who is so beloved.

Scholarly Discipline and Discipleship. Academic students take a disciplined approach to their college work, and many of them are also preparing for scholarly work for their living. Among them is an eagerness, and sometimes much anxiety, to find their scholarly disciplines and to get down to work in them as early as possible.¹⁵

The common root of discipline and discipleship suggests a close relationship between the meaning of the one and the meaning of the other. The discipline of the scholar and the discipleship of the Christian, however, are not identical. The mastery of the language, methodology, and content of a subject matter and the ability to contribute to it in a critical and original way is different from the formation of a life in accord with the divine freedom and human responsibility enabled and received by faith in Jesus Christ. Academic discipline and Christian discipleship fortify one another; they do not substitute for one another.

¹⁵von Hoffman, op. cit., p. 128.

Christian discipleship fortifies scholarly life, especially in the protean undergraduate years, at at least three dangerous points. One is the danger of the perversion of the academic student's cultural and social role as an intellectual into intellectualizing. A second is the danger of the perversion of his academic discipline in the sense of self-control into repression. A third is the danger of the perversion of a fine discrimination of myriad shades of gray into compulsive doubt and indecision.¹⁶

Intellectualizing, repression, and compulsive doubt and indecision frequently travel in a team and are terms used to speak of a neurotic pattern. Daniel Jenkins says that academic life tends to favor that neurotic pattern and to reproduce it in students much given to academic life.

Universities are staffed by people whose characteristic personality type is that of the neurotic introvert. In itself, this might not be serious, but such people tend to favour those of similar type in their selection processes, and it is those who are thus selected who are chosen increasingly to lead society. The truth is, however, that in most important areas of life, it is the intelligent extrovert who is best equipped to lead. . . . Those who lost out in the academic rat-race, who are the objects of much misplaced sympathy, are in fact the fortunate ones, because they are able to lead self-respecting, cheerful, and well-adjusted lives from an early age.¹⁷

The intellectualizing defense is common among academic students in part because the use of that defense is strongly reinforced by the

¹⁶Graham Blaine and Charles McArthur (eds.), Emotional Problems of the Student (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1966), p. 73.

¹⁷Daniel Jenkins, The Educated Society (London: Faber and Faber, 1966), p. 105.

college with which they closely identify. There are few student problems that do not seem to call for reasoning together and further study or few college counsels to students which do not encourage thinking things out. Indeed, the exhortation to reflect is an increasing administrative admonition when the reverse of intellectualizing their problems--namely acting them out--is presently taken up by some students. The academic student is capable of prodigious feats of self-analysis and of subjecting very emotional experiences--stirring music, gripping drama, devout patriotism, and even affection for her boyfriend or his girlfriend--to much thought. In short, the academic student, supplied with high intelligence, can drown himself in think.

Christian discipleship which is continuing in the divine word of forgiveness and trusting it as the truth which frees is the stance around which the academic student can stand intellectual life. The stature of the disciple being assured by grace, he need not take thought to increase it. He need not fear what he cannot control or justify with thought, not even himself. He has available the grace of humor, too, to catch and comfort himself when intellectualizing. He has the communion of saints to give him perspective on the community of scholars. He has by faith the freedom to right his reasoning.

A second danger to the academic student is the perversion of academic discipline into repression. The early, double commitment of the academic student to ideas and the college makes him something of a convert to adulthood. That is, he tends to be further through adolescence than, possibly, the collegiate student, and his controlling mechanisms are in ascendency. The balance of freedom and control of

impulse achieved in maturity may not yet be reached, and his enthusiasm as a convert to adulthood may have a grim and fanatic quality.

But the controls developed for the purpose of inhibiting impulse are still unseasoned and uncertain; they are likely to operate in a rigid manner, that is, to be rather overdone, as if the danger of their giving way altogether were still very real. . . . The achievement of flexible control, an arrangement in which there is genuine freedom of impulses because there is little danger of their getting out of hand, still lies ahead; nevertheless impulses are now inhibited or contained with sufficient effectiveness so that the young person can turn his attention to other matters. He is now ready to concentrate upon his relations with the external world.¹⁸

Popular designations for academic students--grinds, grubs, worms, wonks (know spelled backwards)--suggest something of the tight discipline such students maintain. They are students who dare not get too personally involved in any one of their courses, lest the others suffer, or get too interested in any of their courses lest that involvement take up the time and energy needed to churn out papers and other demanded abstractions of their experience. Furthermore, they dare not get too involved, if at all, in the social and political issues of their times beyond the campus.

How can students seek out a sense of relatedness to the society's problems and explosions and still meet these intensified academic challenges? Or are the politically and socially concerned ones barely passing while the apathetic ones make Phi Beta Kappa? A consuming interest and ambition in academic achievement could take a student away from concerns, let alone involvement, in political and social realities beyond the campus. For some of the most thoughtful and socially minded students, the active and intelligent use of their minds along with the post-Sputnik intensifying of academic challenge in schools and colleges could lead to more interest in and more relationship with political and social concerns. The argument is that if students are made to use their

¹⁸Nevitt Sanford (ed.), The American College (New York: Wiley and Sons, 1962), p. 260.

minds more, those minds will work more astutely on the issues of the day than they would have in the pre-Sputnik academic climate. This argument is less and less impressive the more one sees and hears of college courses and programs that are harder without being more genuinely intelligent, which take up more time but do not touch the individual reflective mind any more than the pre-Sputnik courses did.¹⁹

Among the academic students who accept academic appeals to the conscience for assiduous study are likely to be a few "over-achievers." In the speech of the guidance field, the over-achiever is one who so heavily invests himself in scholarly work to the exclusion of many other human activities that he achieves higher grades than he would if he were to live a more balanced life. Such students are often unhappily identified only after a nervous collapse.

Christians as Christians have no special competence to treat problems in the psychology of learning. However, the disciple who follows a Lord who arouses total devotion--not simply that of the mind--will have some experience of that fullness of life and balance of life which He gives when less and less is held back from Him. It could occur to the Christian disciple that, in learning, the ally of the teacher is as much the impulse life of the student as the conscience and that good scholarship arises out of a sense of passionate involvement as out of a sense of duty.²⁰ The taught-of-God disciple also appreciates the ways God speaks in persons and events and would be Christianly skeptical of learning which is confined to books, as important as they are indeed. Similarly, the vantage point of faith

¹⁹Mallery, op. cit., p. 134.

leaves one skeptical of learning which long excuses the student from human responsibility to himself as a whole person and to the present neighbor. Christian discipleship which includes the commanded and enabled love for the self--and in psychological terms could mean loving the id as much as the superego²¹--stands against that perverted kind of academic discipline which loves only a part of the self as fit for life and work.

A third danger is the perversion of the academic student's heightened sensibility and fine discrimination into doubt and indecision. The Hamlet-like figure "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought" is not among American academic students. But there is more generally among academic students, on the verge of nonconformist behavior but resisting it, a sharp sense of cultural pluralism, moral relativism, the ironies of history, and the ambiguity of the actions of individuals and groups. One of the difficulties of growing up for the bright and precocious student is that often when he most needs a model of resolute action, reason and right, he is most able to see all the personal corruption, compromised principles, immorality, inconsistency, and bafflement of the world most clearly. Urban blight in the midst of affluence, racism veiled in property rights and calls for law and order, a costly war alleged to ensure freedoms abroad which are in question for many at home, the waging of a nuclear arms race to ensure peace, and a revolution in human sensibility among the young of doubtful outcome for many academic values are among the current events in

²¹von Hoffman, op. cit., p. 168.

which the alert student sees myriad shades of gray regarding the situation and his response.

There are several responses one can make to a world the academic student may astutely and acutely sense is fragmented, dangerous, and absurd. Setting aside the largely involuntary response of madness from our consideration, most observers of college students report them either dropping out of society, participating in it cynically for private satisfactions, or taking up radical political activity to change society at whatever point they can take any reasonably clear action and taking up resistance when they know not the right but clearly see the wrong. The academic student tends neither to drop out nor take up a radical political or resistance position, for he is too committed to the college, to his specialization, and to the present adult world to do so. A few may take up an uncritical response and traditional pieties, but they can do this less well than can the collegiate and vocational students. Some take up a cynical response and seek in increasing privatism some clarity and rationale for maintaining their public and academic lives.

Christian discipleship, itself fortified by a community of disciples and tradition which supports a different perspective on the world than that of the larger society, is not so much a resource for what one is to think and do about the world as it is a disposition toward that doing and thinking. Movement beyond inaction and doubt when a clear course is difficult to determine is enabled by a faith that trusts in the forgiveness of sins and an obedience that requires action upon the light one has been given. The disciple is not given

any illumination of present events apart from sound study and theological reflection, but he tries not to sin against the Holy Spirit by failing to act upon the light he has been given and boldly seizes the promise of more light as he acts. Dropping out of society or uncritical or cynical participation in society are responses far short of the judgment and reform of it which the Christian disciple shares with his Lord and which he knows must begin with himself when he is tempted to cynicism and withdrawal.

Knowledge and Truth. Certainly one cannot say much about the relationship between knowledge and truth in a paragraph, and yet something must be said about the high value academic students place upon knowledge from the vantage point of the church's understanding of truth. It follows most naturally from the references to discipleship in the paragraph above, for "truth" and "discipleship" are lived together in Christian existence and have been thought about together since the Dominical words brought them together: "If you continue in my word, you are indeed my disciples, and you shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."²²

When meanings are coupled like "discipline and discipleship" or "knowledge and truth" in this paper, it is intended that the second in every pair not overthrow the first. Rather, the second lays a special Christian claim on the first and is actually prior to the first in Christian existence.

Christianly speaking, Jesus Christ is the truth. "I am the

²²John 8:31-32.

the way, the truth, and the life,"²³ He tells his disciples, and their discipleship means, among other gifts, continuing in an active response like that of Jesus to the present will of God which is the truth which makes them free. One of the things it makes them free for is knowledge.

The academic student tends to work differently in this matter by intending to move from knowledge to truth and freedom rather than from truth and freedom to knowledge. He may daily pass in and out of his college library under the portal inscription, "The Truth Will Make You Free," but be encouraged in his belief that wide reading liberates. Unfortunately, that which has been lopped off of the Johannine passage --the Son who makes you free and the discipleship of continuing in His word--is a loss of the Christian order and substance.

It is by no means clear that the most widely read persons are the most "free." They may simply subject their wide reading to criticism from a previously determined point of view. Or they may be able to discuss many points of view while holding none of their own. The gospel is talking about a freedom which is really prior to study and learning. Reading all those books will not in itself make men free. Rather men need to free in order to read all those books without indifference and without doing violence to what the books have to say.²⁴

The italicized passage (in the original) above suggests the special claim that faith in Christ as the truth lays upon knowledge. This truth is not something which a student may possess, as he may be said to possess knowledge. This truth is something which possesses the student. It is not a result of seeking and possessing, but it provides

²³John 14:6.

²⁴Richard Luecke, New Meanings for New Beings (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), pp. 201-02.

the conditions for seeking and possessing knowledge.

It is not likely that the college and university will ever again have one way of uniting all knowledge, if it indeed ever did. It is as important as ever, therefore, that each student hold his specialized knowledge in the manner of faith. Specialist knowledge is too likely to be built up in ignorance of other human needs by students disinclined or disabled to concern themselves with any unprecedented demands arriving in new situations. The academic student is as likely to work mischief upon the world as the vocational student when his specialized knowledge functions in the same way as a specialized skill and without concern for the larger consequences of his actions on the basis of his specialized knowledge. Short of faith in Jesus Christ as the truth which frees the pursuit and use of knowledge, there is scant freedom to question the knowledge one possesses and the life he leads, really listen to the neighbor scholar, or stand the multiversity of knowledge with equanimity. Neither a world-view under which specialty knowledge is subsumed nor the effort to strain all knowledge through each one's specialty is to be encouraged by Christian ministry.

Christians have sometimes taken the university to task for failing to be the kind of university that Newman or Moberly or Nash thought it ought to be. There has been too much easy talk about the university having become a "multiversity" with no overarching and unifying motif, a "cafeteria" and so on. Certainly no one wishes to defend the often disastrous extent to which the contemporary university education has been sliced, packaged, and dished out to students who buy it by the unit. But it is highly unlikely that we can ever again have any unifying world-view under which the various departments of knowledge can be subsumed. The proliferation of world-views and their progressive relativization is a hallmark of our time. It is part of what we mean by secularization. Neither Christianity, "Western Civilization," nor even "Humanities" can be expected to provide what was once provided by

the all-encompassing and comparatively unified world-picture of the medieval university.²⁵

Harvey Cox's celebration of the secularization of the university above may be theologically giddy, making its sores into stigmata, but it is supported by at least one distinguished educator. Clark Kerr argues for the multiversity on the basis of its increasing the possibility of choice and ending the tyranny of a single meaning.

One of the advantages of a big city or a big university--as against a smaller and more monolithic closed community--is that people can find those things which may mean something to them. They are given a choice. It would be terribly stultifying to find yourself in a place which has a single meaning, and that meaning is the same for everyone. The only kind of society that has a single meaning is an authoritarian one. It seems to me that is a place where you would really expect rebellion. Essentially, what the FSM [Free Speech Movement] are [sic] saying is that they are rebelling against the freedom of choice.²⁶

The theological-educational coalition and cross-fertilization of thought evidenced in the lengthy quotations above stress all the more urgently the need for the ministry of the church to make the single meaning of Jesus Christ as the truth apprehended in faith more and more available to students who must make harder choices and longer forays on its basis into the department stores of knowledge.

The ministry of the church to academic students who highly value knowledge is that preaching, pastoral care, and celebrating in community of the gospel which creates faith in Jesus Christ as the truth.

²⁵Harvey Cox, The Secular City (New York: Macmillan, 1965), pp. 228-29.

²⁶Michael Miller and Susan Gilmore (eds.), Revolution at Berkeley (New York: Dell, 1965), p. 87.

The church is not charged to add some Christian knowledge to other kinds of knowledge as their superior or to seek an omniscient Christian way of saying what all other kinds of knowledge are about. Rather the church is to confess and celebrate the ultimate coherence of all knowledge and truths in no formulation but "in Christ." The ministry of the church is essentially to the spiritual life of the student, and it is the Spirit of truth which Jesus has promised his disciples to guide them into all truth. To be "in Christ" and to be guided by the "Spirit of truth" are the same, and every tolerance for diversity, technique for understanding, and means for co-operation among men of different perceptions, conceptions, and languages are properly celebrated as gifts of the Spirit. The academic student is to be spiritually emboldened with "truth in the inward parts" to seek out knowledge wherever it may lead.

CHAPTER VI

THE NONCONFORMIST STUDENT SUBCULTURE

I. BIOGRAPHICAL GLIMPSE OF NONCONFORMIST STUDENT

David Steiner inches the door to his apartment open slowly, successfully hushing the noisy hinges for the sake of his sleeping roommates. At three in the morning it is possible they are asleep, although it would be rash to bet on it. Slipping out of his boots and parka, he pads across the hall to check the bedrooms. The "Guru" and Greeley are asleep, and in his bed they have curled some sweet young thing who stayed too late to take a safe ride home in the subway. "Nice guys," Dave smiles inside, "always taking in some stray in my rack! Well, she couldn't be safer in her own."

Dave takes somebody's poncho from the closet for a blanket, removes the protest buttons which might prick him in the night, and heads through the kitchen toward the couch in the pit. He bows to throw some warm water on his face at the kitchen sink and rises with a water-beaded beard to look for a paper towel. Finding none, he drips into the pit.

In the yellow glow of the street light and some neon blips of red and green coming in from the street, the living room turns on and off. Around him are two or three years of his cast off passions, a collection of his shells and skins and those of his roommates, now shed. In blinks, like an early silent film, one sees some old, now standard psychedelia on the walls. On the ceiling is a beautiful black-light

mandala. There are also some old posters of Mao, Jesus, Lyndon Johnson (pock-marked by darts), and Ravi Shankar, but most are almost covered over now with selected graffiti and bumper stickers. Only John Kennedy's picture is untouched. There is also a stuffed buffalo head on which has been put an Indian headdress and beads.

There are several newer things in the pit, including two very good collages, one in melted plastics and one in paper clippings and pictures. In the latter, pictures of women putting on make-up in cosmetic advertisements are juxtaposed with pictures of soldiers and napalmed peasants dressing wounds. There is some felt and burlap work Greeley has hung by his pin-up of Joan Baez. Perhaps too close to her picture is a placard in bold, black letters of S.C.R.E.W.U., an acronym for a bogus Student Committee to Right Every Wrong of the University. There are also many books, journals, magazines, and records in piles or in orange-crate shelves. Two guitars and a recorder are by an FM radio.

The "Guru" buys and reads most of the books even though he has not been enrolled in the University since his disastrous junior year a year ago. He has, therefore, the time to think. Conveniently IV-F due to poor eyesight, he spends his time drawing Thurberesque cartoons for Abyss, an underground journal, working at odd jobs, and inventing an elaborate game that joins mathematical theory and military strategy to the movements of chess-like pieces on something like an abacus. So far no one can play it but himself. The "Guru" can be at war with himself for hours on end, all the while writing notes to himself at headquarters to refine the game. In a manner of speaking, the "Guru" flunked

out of the University, but he is as much a drop-out as a push-out. He has read through volumes on existentialism, mysticism, and oriental religion, psychoanalysis, ESP, art, and some jag reading of Norse sagas, Tolkien, and McLuhan. After reading the latter, he went "off print" for a month and did almost nothing but see movies and study TV commercials. He even went to a Roman Catholic mass, but he didn't find it very tactile at all.

Greeley is the musician in the group, and in his corner of their common property are snarls of tapes for a symphony he is putting together from recordings of street sounds. His "Suburban Symphony No. 1" of lawn mowers, hedge clippers, ice cube tinkles, diving board shudders, pool splashes, and sports car idlings and accelerations is his masterpiece to date, a contemporary pastorate. He alone in the group has smoked a little pot, and then only a few times to see how it would intensify his experience of music. It tended to make him sick. No one in the group has taken LSD or really needs to. Greeley is studying anthropology "on the side," as he says, and is doing good work at the university with almost a full load each quarter. He has a particularly fine ear for languages and teaches at a Berlitz school at night to support himself and his tape recorder. At the moment he is of the opinion that much of Hebrew can be traced to the sounds made by camels. The "Guru" thinks this theory is Fascist.

"Life among the aesthetes," muses David, "both being pecked to death by goslings." David is the activist in the group, having participated in successive waves of the movement. Where his roommates tend to turn in on their worlds, he tends to turn out. Now in his senior

year after five and a half years in and out of three colleges, he looks over his early, innocent years in civil rights marches and sit-ins to his more earnest, angrier, and more dangerous involvement now in Viet Nam war protests and draft resistance. The late meeting from which he has just returned was one of the Viet Nam Day Continuation Committee in which he had tangled hotly with some Hippies who are beginning to come to its meetings. Dave is skeptical and even contemptuous of "flower power," "messaging minds," and "pollyanarchy" and gladly greets the passing of such junk. "Let LBJ say 'We shall overcome' and Sears sell sandals and beds," he shouted tonight, "and let the dead bury the dead." The Bible passage that came to him in that moment surprised him. Did he see it in a work of Sister Mary Corita?

David is about to complete his degree, although he has two Incompletes to finish before he has official third quarter senior status. His writing for several student journals and mimeographs exchanged with CADRE keep him from those papers. Starting out in chemistry at a small, regionally respected, vaguely denominational college in which his parents enrolled him, he first switched to journalism at North Carolina for a semester and then to sociology at NYU where he is finishing up. "Or, then again, I might not," he has said lately. His work is very good when he does it, although terribly erratic, and his transcripts show the gamut from A to F. At the moment he is in one of his very restless moods and can do everything but study. This past week he wrote an excellent pacifist reply to a real-politik analysis of the Viet Nam war that appeared in Umbrage, but he has done no university work at all. David is not a pacifist, but he

wanted to see what case could be made for it and played with the theme until he almost persuaded himself with his own arguments.

In between matriculations in his colleges, he has been across the country, almost half the way by Honda. He worked a summer for SNCC in Mississippi. There he also went through a deep, painful love affair with Karen which racked him up for a year. Somehow she had wanted to live out of his strength and off the movement rather than bring their strengths together. What it was that was wrong may never be known, but not for want of analysis. But that is over and busted. David is presently too enmeshed in politics for a new relationship, although he takes his shirts to a girl in Newark on the weekends and cooks spaghetti in wine sauce for them while she washes and irons for him. So far it means just long talks, spaghetti, and laundry.

David starts to pull the corduroy curtains to darken the room to sleep and notes an air mail special delivery letter for him on his desk. The printed return address tells it is from his father, who habitually dictates personal letters to his secretary and sends them out on his life insurance business letterheads and envelopes. David draws the curtains anyway. He does not want ever to think about selling life insurance to people who are already dead. Nor is he in any mind or mood to read a letter from his father tonight. It is very late, or early, and the morning will be too soon enough.

II. ORIGINS AND CHARACTER OF NONCONFORMIST STUDENT SUBCULTURE

In the Clark-Trow typology the nonconformist student subculture embraces students highly committed to ideas and minimally committed to the college. The descriptions of the nonconformist student seem to be particularly difficult to put sharply in the sociological research using the Clark-Trow typology--David Gottlieb simply says "This person is interested in learning about life in general, but in a manner of his own choosing"¹--for several reasons one might readily suspect.

First, a student subculture which is so minimally committed to the college, which is a reasonably manageable and relatively closed system for study, is difficult to circumscribe very neatly. Off-campus and para-campus groups are their primary points of reference, and it follows, secondly, that a great variety of relationships in many different groups on the campus fringes would need to be accounted for in the nonconformist subculture. Such an account necessarily becomes unwieldy. Thirdly, the very nature of nonconformity makes the nonconformist subculture something of a catch-all for personal styles of life and social groups which are not vocational, collegiate, or academic in attitudes and actions, but about which styles and groups it is difficult to speak positively. Clark and Trow themselves conclude, "The nonconformist subculture eludes easy characterization. It may, in fact, constitute a residual category, concealing within it quite

¹David Gottlieb and Charles Ramsey, The American Adolescent (Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1964), p. 192.

different kinds of attitudes and orientations, some which are on the rise, some of which are declining in their importance."²

Since the nonconformists are the least vocational in their orientation, it is sometimes difficult to discern the adult roles, if any, toward which they are tending. Fourthly, it is the case that a very small percentage of college students are nonconformists, and one finds it necessary to say a great deal about a volatile few. Depending upon the definition of nonconformity, but within the Clark-Trow guidelines, most researchers range nonconformist students between one and five per cent of the present college student population.³ However, some characteristics of the nonconformist subculture are the extreme of characteristics growing among students generally, as will be noted below. Fifthly, the nonconformist student subculture in the last few years, especially following the Berkeley demonstrations of 1964, has received so much news coverage and so much comment from so many quarters that the literature is now massive. The A.B. now would seem to mean After Berkeley. In this long chapter the discussion is largely confined to materials from psychological and sociological research, the commentaries of educators, and some of the students themselves.

Generally, in this chapter to be developed, the discussion takes up the

²Theodore Newcomb and Everett Wilson, College Peer Groups (Chicago: Aldine, 1966), p. 24.

³G. Kerry Smith (ed.), Higher Education Reflects on Itself and on the Larger Society (Washington: National Education Association, 1966), p. 164; and Richard Peterson, The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1964-1965 (Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1966), p. 43.

nonconformist students who tend to take up an aesthetic life, accentuating sense experience and artistic creativity, or a radical political life, accentuating social protest, participatory democracy, and direct action on the basis of their discontents. Many combine both attitudes in action. A subtle blend of "dropping out" of the larger society, including the life of the college in various degrees, and "being in" on various movements to reform or protest the direction or directionlessness of the larger society, including the college, is a prevalent personal style. The origins of these students are complex, penetrate one another, and sometimes can only be conjectured.

The social origins of the nonconformist students are very similar to the academic students, and it was noted earlier that the latter frequently are the source of the former. Some middle class, suburban, academically and socially advantaged students arrive in colleges which they come to refuse. These few students tend to split off of the academic student subculture, having become discontented with the life of the college, and seek to fulfill their interests in ideas in other ways. The cause of the split is frequently a college out of human scale.

Counterposed against this theme of an intelligent, independent, critically-minded student input, there frequently stands a college or university with all those unfortunate properties--large classes, faculty disinterested in teaching and the needs of students, intense competition for grades (and consequent widespread cheating), bureaucratic dealings with students, in loco parentis control of personal life, and so forth--in the language of the disaffected, the rat-race, the computerized conveyor belt, the phoniness of it all, the hypocrisy. The point is, that from any of these able students, their encounter with the university has been a

disappointment; out of frustration, many have looked off campus for sources of commitment that are more fulfilling.⁴

The bureaucratization of the colleges and the close company they keep with government, the military, and business in a "system" of "channeling manpower" are seen, in the nonconformist attitude toward these developments, to be creating a college to which it is deadly for human beings to conform. Nonconformity becomes a way of asserting humanity, and a minority of students say they would rather "die than be standardized, replaceable and irrelevant."⁵

Foreign and domestic social and political revolutions deeply move nonconformist students to the emulation of them in their own situations. Students who returned to campuses after participation in the early civil rights demonstrations and sit-ins of the sixties were veterans of the method they applied to redress their grievances against the colleges. "They had heard the presidents of their colleges say that freedom is indivisible. Very well, then, academic freedom, civil rights, and civil liberties are a single continuum."⁶

The extension of academic freedom to the claim to freedom-to-learn implies a revolutionary change in the status of American college-going. Up to now, American collegians have been regarded, and have regarded themselves, as late adolescents; but the claim to Lernfreiheit means that they are young adults who are capable of knowing what they ought to get.⁷

⁴Peterson, The Scope, pp. 44-45.

⁵Esther Lloyd-Jones (ed.), The American Student and His College (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1966), p. 41.

⁶Ibid., p. 294.

⁷Michael Miller and Susam Gilmore (eds.), Revolution at Berkeley (New York: Dell, 1965), p. 28.

More recently, the black power movement and the anti-Viet Nam war movement are taken together by nonconformists as ways to resist the exploitation of minorities by the "establishment." To continue to use their rhetoric, the "colonialism" practiced by the white suburbs over the black ghettos is scarcely to be distinguished, in their view, from the "imperialistic Pax Americana" and puppet government support by the United States in Viet Nam. On their campuses, the nonconformists score the paternalism and manipulation of the administration with the same spirit they score the above "colonialism" and "imperialism."

Despite their occasional rhetorical forms, the ideological origins of nonconformist students engaged in radical politics should not be far sought in the ideologies of their nonconformist elders. They are not simply young Communists, and indeed they often score Communism as an empty materialistic shell not entirely unlike the stagnant American labor movement and the liberal Great Society of lost momentum. Rather, many tend to be without ideology or metaphysics, and their beliefs, while passionate, are few. Their politics are more existential and centered in issues rather than in ideology. Some simply negate all systems to the point of social nihilism. Some take delight in the fervor of critical and direct action itself.⁸

Almost without exception, that minority which subscribes to Communist ideology renounces the bureaucratic socialism that now governs the Soviet Bloc. The common attitudes toward hard-line Communists is exemplified in the Port Huron Statement--manifesto of Students for a Democratic Society--as one of disavowal and

⁸Charles Havice (ed.), Campus Values (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1966), p. 24.

disappointment because of the Party's betrayal of democracy and true socialism.⁹

Among the ideologically aligned groups are the Progressive Labor Club, Young Peoples Socialist League (right wing socialist), W. E. DeBois Club (Marxist), Youth Socialist Alliance (Trotskyite), and the Students for a Democratic Society (a liberal-socialist coalition).¹⁰ Other groups rise ad hoc, like the Free Speech Movement and the May Second Movement, to form broad fronts for many smaller groups and individuals to meet specific issues. Some nonconformists participate in adult organizations for reform, especially in the areas of civil rights and peace movements. Some participate in the National Student Association which has gone increasingly left in recent years and in local student associations seeking "student power." On the ideological right are the Young Americans for Freedom, some nationally unaffiliated conservative and individualist clubs, and a small number of Ayn Rand societies.

The "knowledge explosion" deeply touches the nonconformist students and shapes them. Extensively prepared in greatly upgraded secondary schools and tried in the fires of aptitude tests and fierce competition to enter the best colleges, these students arrive in them more seasoned and sophisticated than the freshman class of ten years ago. Colleges in the lead in the academic procession are able to lop off much of the work formerly offered in the freshman year and offer

⁹Smith, op. cit., p. 165.

¹⁰Havice, op. cit., p. 22.

work formerly reserved for the early graduate years in the junior and senior years. This shift often means more work of an independent and critical character, and the superior high schools and colleges are to be given credit for educating their own critics.

How is the rise of this "new student activism" to be explained? Since they are disproportionately enrolled in selective colleges and universities, students actively concerned with broad social and moral issues are undoubtedly concentrated at the high end of that intellectual ability distribution; they are bright enough to detect and comprehend some of what ails American society. In this vein, judging from the relative peace at teachers colleges and technical institutes, it would seem that the intellectual interests of the student activists tend more toward ideas than jobs. Their intellectual bent probably emphasizes comparing and criticizing rather than mastery of facts and skills. In short, because of some combination of genetic and environmental circumstances, these youths have acquired an intellectual style that has lent itself well to critical examination of what is going on around them.¹¹

Furthermore, the "knowledge explosion" does not simply mean more knowledgeable students and the greatly increased number of facts and figures about man and nature now known or knowable upon further research, but it also means a communications revolution. This college generation has been reared in an environment of television, paperbacks, records, prints, duplicators, tapes, films, polaroid cameras, transistor radios, and rapid travel in which one may be enveloped in nothing less than the whole world. A sensitive student, it seems reasonable to surmise, may develop a deep sense of history in the making, of his participation in the lives of other men and emerging patterns of events, and of the "revolution of rising expectations." Such a student would likely be led to sharper moral judgments, more radical political action, and more

¹¹Peterson, op. cit., p. 44.

urgent participation in that life mediated to him which is wider than the campus. Marshall McLuhan proposes a provocative thesis regarding the origins of nonconformist students by means of modern media of communication.

The drop-out situation in our schools at present has only begun to develop. The young student today grows up in an electrically configured world. It is a world not of wheels but of circuits, not of fragments but of integral patterns. The student today lives mythically and in depth. At school, however, he encounters a situation organized by means of classified information. The subjects are unrelated. They are visually conceived in terms of a blueprint. The student can find no possible means of involvement for himself nor can he discover how the educational scene relates to the mythic world he takes for granted. As one IBM executive put it, "My children had lived several lifetimes compared to their grandparents when they began grade one."¹²

Closely allied with the nearly exponential expansion of knowledge and the development of highly participatory, instantaneous communications is a moral and cultural revolution also worthier of greater mention than can here be made of it as another point of origin of the nonconformist student. Nonconformists tend to live closer than their parents and some of their peers to all that is now. They tend to take the "sexual revolution" for granted and are guided less by law and convention than by love and contraceptives in their sexual relationships. One suspects that the "sexual revolution" in American colleges is more of a verbal than a social phenomenon, but some research shows women students are generally freer in their sex lives than their mothers were at their age.¹³ One safely guesses male students are not

¹²Marshall McLuhan, Understanding Media (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), p. vii.

¹³Mervin Freedman, The College Experience (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967), p. 127.

unaffected by that development. Certainly the whole of life of college students generally--in clothing, cars, sports, dances, music, entertainments, and much else--is more erotic in character,

Nonconformists tend to participate more deeply in the "sensibility revolution." They live naturally with the new sounds in music, especially the atonal, electric, and various rock forms (folk rock, raga rock, jug rock, etc.); appreciate the newer dramatic forms of the Theatre of the Absurd, the New Wave film, the Happening, the psychedelic and synesthesiogenic experiences of the light show; and buy and make the cooler art forms of Pop, Op, and other various post-abstract expressionist forms of painting and sculpture. On the fringe of the nonconformist student subculture is some experimentation with marijuana, the hallucinogenic or mind-manifesting drugs, and various kinds of Eastern religious disciplines. Kenneth Keniston speaks of some students having a "kind of cult of experience, which stresses, in the words of one student, 'the maximum possible number of sense experiences.'"¹⁴ Few of the present student nonconformists seem to live quite the same withdrawn quest for "kicks" as did the "Beats" of the last generation; most tend to be much less grim and more colorful than both the Beats and the academic students.

For most experience is sought in ways less asocial than sex [sic], speed, and stimulants. But travel, artistic and expressive experience, the enjoyment of nature, the privacy of erotic love, or the company of friends occupy a similar place in the hierarchy of values. Parallel with this goes the search for self within the

Erik Erikson (ed.), The Challenge of Youth (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1965), p. 208.

self rather than in society, activity or commitment, and the belief that truth can be uncovered by burrowing within the psyche. The experience sought is private, even solipsistic; it involves indifference to the wider beckonings of society.¹⁵

Perhaps strange to say, the short presidency of John Kennedy is sometimes linked with the origins of the nonconformist student subculture.¹⁶ Himself very much a product of the "establishment" and the most conservative of liberals, he yet seemed to bring together intelligence, youth, hope, and social concern in a way few "over thirty" had done before, at least in the lifetimes of those under thirty. He aroused some young people who might otherwise have cared less in politics and more in business to a political awareness, especially of the issues of poverty, race, and peace, and the realization that the young, much younger than the young president, were nearly the majority of Americans. The effects of his assassination upon the young are impossible to measure, but there is a discernable sense of loss and of disappointment in his successor.

The psychological origins of the nonconformist student subculture would be difficult to discuss short of individual case histories. Generalizations are dangerous and sometimes ridiculous at this point. When nonconformists protest rules or practices they believe to be unjust, their protest has been all but dismissed, in the writer's hearing, as the result of a generation of permissive child-rearing. Only slightly more illuminating is the explanation that such protest is the

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Peterson, op. cit., p. 45.

classical Oedipal conflict in its contemporary manifestation.

A Freudian clash of sons against the fathers, as some commentators (fathers) have suggested . . . is so ancient and archetypal a social mechanism--certainly it functions in almost every revolution, political or artistic, that it affords little insight into the campus turmoil.¹⁷

An objection to such broad psychological judgments is not that they may be wrong, but that they tend to obscure other psychological considerations, not to mention social, political, and historical considerations of the origins of nonconformist behavior. Some further psychological considerations are noted in this chapter, and each is intended to be understood as illuminating only parts of the nonconformist student subculture.

In some few cases nonconformity has its origin in psychological illness. In a rare clinical study of nonconformist students suffering acute diffusion of ego-identity and receiving psychiatric care in their own group while they continued college, their therapist, H. G. Whittington, dwells chiefly on the effects of the nonconformist group affiliation and style for their distress. On the "positive" side, he found their group mutually supporting and a ready source of allies against the larger society.

The group would seem to be one that was devoted to trying to help its members achieve deviancy without craziness, unconventionality without social condemnation, independence without pauperism, humanism without anarchy, personal identity without capitulation to rigid cultural demands, and enjoyment without pain. The group was also devoted to intellectualism, cultural and personal relativism, tolerance, kindness, social justice, and improvement

¹⁷Miller and Gilmore, op. cit., p. 59.

of the lot of man, without bigotry, inhumanity, hypocrisy, or self-seeking.¹⁸

On the "negative" side, it was his opinion that the alienation of individuals in the group was heightened by the formal, almost creedal, alienation and distrust of the group. The group was, so to speak, "sicker" than the sum of its members. The acute diffusion of ego-identity of any member of the group was more difficult to resolve in the group, for the group often prevented relationships outside it which might help in the individual's resolution of his distress. The group itself provided inadequate ways for dealing with superego pressures by justifying the behavior of individual members and by being unlikely to let anyone outgrow the group. It should be noted that some nonconformity has its origin in the ordinary developmental processes of late adolescence and young adulthood--in Erik Erikson's terms, the crises of identity versus identity diffusion and intimacy versus isolation¹⁹--and ought not to be considered psychological illness.

Some nonconformity has been discussed in terms of its origins in a "generation gap," which in its extreme sense means that there are differences in the perceptions of the same phenomena by the older and younger amounting to their living in different psychological worlds.²⁰ So long as the rate of change in a society is relatively slow,

¹⁸H. G. Whittington, Psychiatry on the College Campus (New York: International Universities Press, 1963), p. 21.

¹⁹Erik Erikson, "Identity and the Life Cycle," Psychological Issues, I (1959), 120.

²⁰Lloyd-Jones, op. cit., p. 18.

successive generations tend to share common frames of reference, sets of mind, and points of view. However, since the births of most contemporary college and graduate students in the middle 1940's, the rate of social change in the United States has been so rapid that the psychological world of the college student is significantly different from that of their elders.

As a consequence, and even though we have made certain intellectual accommodations to these changes, we in fact do not have an effective basis for communication with today's college student. Out of this arises his distrust of us, and our antagonism toward him. We believe in the system which got us out of the Depression and won World War II for us. Order, patience, and slow progress toward a well-defined goal about which we remained optimistic characterized our solutions to our problems. By contrast, today's college student has not seen in his entire lifetime the final solution to a single one of the problems with which he has grown up. He takes affluence as a given. A kind of accommodation with the Soviet Union has been developed, but it is tenuous and its ultimate course imponderable. Red China threatens. Viet Nam festers, the race revolution waxes more or less violent. And so on. Thus, the younger generation has little reason to trust the system in which we have implicit faith.²¹

What appears as, and sometimes is, an attack on "The American Way of Life" in some nonconformist behavior--especially the placard and picket protests and radical politics on the one hand and the "dropping out" of the "rat race" on the other--springs in part from different perceptions of the present situation and the different responses to felt needs of the older and younger. Those who, a generation or two ago, found meaning in the soil, their God, their families, their country, and in business and industry are likely to consider nonconformist almost any response of the young who find no soil to till, God

²¹Smith, op. cit., p. 156.

in very beleaguered health if not dead, families separated by divorce or by the scattering of its members into specialized work and peer groups, patriotism at best a hindrance to internationalism and at worst a front for an unjust status quo, and business and industry as the creators of an impersonal, bureaucratic, and sometimes trivial way of life. Rapid social change subjects college youth to the most stress in American society.

Reared by elders who were formed in a previous version of the society, and anticipating a life in a still different society, they must somehow choose between competing versions of past and future. Thus, it is youth that must chiefly cope with the strains of social change, and among youth, it is "elite" youth who feel these most acutely.²²

The most conspicuous aspect of the problem of "generation gap" relevant to the psychological origins of some nonconformist students is the accusation that they refuse to grow up. Psychologically speaking, they are accused of "arrested adolescence," and sociologically speaking, nonconformists as a group are accused of "institutionalizing adolescence." Whittington, however, observes that American society generally has not decided whether it is a good thing to grow up, or "simply an unavoidable event that must be delayed as long as possible and then accepted with whatever grace can be mustered."²³ If so, then the American colleges are either the arenas for long delayed psychological weaning or the arenas in our society where a new kind of adult is emerging. Nonconformists sometimes are a prophetic minority and

²²Erikson, Challenge of Youth, p. 200.

²³Whittington, op. cit., p. 7.

the first fruits of a whole generation to come. Albert van den Heuvel describes the new adult in terms which often characterize the present nonconformists.

The dominant traits of his character will be flexibility rather than stability, trustworthiness rather than predictability, curiosity rather than knowledge, an experimental attitude rather than certainty, meditation rather than preaching, listening rather than proclaiming. He will need to be a man of choice in order to remain a person. His judgment will come tentatively and slowly because of his humor and relativism. His discipline may be strict but he will live on the road rather than in a house, and his decisions will come after discussion with many partners rather than after solitary reflection. Most of his commitments will be short-term with a definite goal. He will search continuously, again and again rethinking his approach to people. In other words, he will look very much like the adolescent.²⁴

It is possible to see both the need of nonconformists to grow up and the need for furthering their valuable adolescent qualities. Paul Goodman is one who interprets nonconformist protest to mean "that the adults are alien and that they are not worth growing up to," and the problem it raises for him is how to make adulthood "more available, more useful, and more noble."²⁵ Growth is only possible and occurs "by losing oneself in some objective world and finding oneself again, larger,"²⁶ and nonconformists, especially those who retire into solipsistic subjectivity, are paying with their lives for the failure of adults to be persons in objective relations to the young.

The last psychological consideration of the origins of the

²⁴Albert van den Heuvel (ed.), The New Creation and the New Generation (New York: Friendship Press, 1965), p. 70.

²⁵Paul Goodman, Compulsory Mis-Education and the Community of Scholars (New York: Vintage, 1964), p. 274.

²⁶Ibid., p. 282.

nonconformist student subculture has already been touched upon in the earlier considerations of psychological illness, "generation gap," and developmental problems, but should receive some separate mention as well. No one word appears in the studies of college students for this consideration, but "alienation" is probably the most frequent word. Other words that appear are usually more or less synonymous with alienation or specifying of it, like estranged, disaffected, anomic, and outcast.

According to Kenneth Keniston, who has done the master work on the alienation of college students in his The Uncommitted, alienation is no simple psychological state. It can mean (1) that feeling of historical loss when cultural patterns change rapidly, leaving the past eclipsed and the future uncertain, and the student frantically grasping for the present as his only certainty. It can mean (2) that feeling of cosmic outcastness when one lives in the time of the "death of God" and the loss of a metaphysically constructed universe and traditions, leading students to feelings of deprivation and rage and the frantic creation ex nihilo of some meaning for their lives. It can mean (3) that developmental estrangement accompanying growth when one loses his past before he gains his future and, in the case of the college student, when one is "hung-up" on late adolescence because adulthood seems such a grim and grisly prospect. It can mean (4) that feeling of unreality accompanying a breakdown, for causes other than developmental gaps, between the conscious self and the productive potential of the individual during which the individual sees and treats himself as a mere object among objects. Classically, such self-estrangement is

connected with the Marxist conception of the alienation of the worker from his labor, but it is also possible to connect it with the alienation of the student from his studies.²⁷

The alienation of nonconformist students leads them to a wide gamut of responses--from delinquency, crime, violence, and revolution at its infrequent furthest remove from general norms to cultural and social criticism and reform movements at its closest remove. Furthermore, alienation can lead both to social withdrawal and radical, socially critical involvement, and there is often friction within loose, nonconformist groups regarding which way individuals act upon their feelings. (A recent example of such friction is that which obtained between the late Hippies, a drop-out group, and various "New Left" students, a move-in group.) Those who withdraw into drugs, personal flamboyance, or exotic compensatory subcultures of their own making and those who seek the radical reform of the larger society in well-disciplined, earnest cadres of resistance and protest are both on or near the campus and give the nonconformist student subculture its volatile character.

When one turns from the origins of the nonconformist student subculture to its sociology, one finds it as difficult to discuss as its etiology. The primary groups and personal styles of nonconformist students are too fluid to define with any of the specificity one might be able to marshal for other student subcultures. It is difficult to

²⁷Kenneth Kenniston, The Uncommitted (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1965), pp. 454 et seqq.

imagine a college which regularly and intentionally maintains within its structures and orders places and events for nonconformity to flourish, as, for example, fraternities encourage the collegiate subculture, honorary societies encourage the academic subculture, and technical and night school courses encourage the vocational subculture. In most cases the latter subcultures serve as intervening variables between the student and the larger college culture and are supporting of that culture. The nonconformist subculture, however, tends to have independent influences and effects upon the student and may be indifferent or competitive with the larger college culture.

An equally important sociological consideration for the fluid nature of the nonconformist subculture is that it tends to develop and change as a whole.²⁸ The other subcultures are more stable and institutionalized--in residences, rituals, charters, curricula, traditions, alumni support, and established campus activities--and slower to change. Indeed, the given stage of an individual's personal growth can sometimes be guessed by his successive subcultural affiliations. (At the college where the writer works, for example, there seems to be a pattern among a large part of its students which begins vocationally, moves through a collegiate phase, and ends academically. Such a pattern is probably due as much to attrition, however, as to any environmental presses.)

The nonconformist subculture itself tends to change from college

²⁸Charles Bidwell (ed.), The American College and Student Personality (Andover, Massachusetts: Social Science Research Council, 1960), p. 47.

generation to generation and even from year to year. Yesterday's nonconformist patterns are not today's, nor will today's be tomorrow's. The expatriates of the 1920's are different from the young socialists of the 1930's; the Beats of the 1950's are different from the Hippies of the 1960's. The folk music and jazz of the 1950's is different from the rock and electronic of the 1960's; Rock and Roll is different from the Twist, and even the early Beatles' music is very different from their recent work. The non-violent "We shall overcome" demonstrations and Peace Corps joining of the early 1960's is a different tactic from the strident, "Hell no, we won't go," draft resistance and the black power movements of the late 1960's. Expresso is very different from LSD; abstract expressionism is very different from Pop art; and the improvised theatre and coffee houses of the 1950's are different from the Love-In and Happening of the 1960's. In short, there is change within the nonconformist student subculture itself, and its members tend to change with it. The cultural forms they shed are taken up by conventional groups, although usually in a denatured form and somewhat self-consciously. There are few things more ephemeral than an analysis of nonconformist students, for it is badly dated almost as soon as the analysis attempted is done.

It is too soon to say what the course of present nonconformists will be in their later years "over thirty," that is, how or if they are eventually socialized into American culture. There is some speculation that nonconformists are increasing in percentages of college students, although very slowly, having a little more influence over their fellow students, and are even having some effect upon cultural

change in society as a whole. They may not enter the mainstream of American culture without altering that stream in some ways. The collegiate, vocational, and academic students tend to be absorbed easily, being already socialized to adult roles in society.

To speak of personal styles of the nonconformist student means first to sift an unusually wide range of behavior for the most frequently occurring causes which are served by it and, secondly, to remark the manner of the service of the causes. It has been noted that nonconformist students are by partial definition highly interested in ideas, but that they act upon them in a manner different from other students, especially the academic students. Indeed, the fact that they act upon ideas, often the same ideas their fellow students entertain or merely hold, sets them apart at the outset. Clark and Trow, however, go on to say that the main cause served in nonconformist activism is identity-seeking.

The forms that this style takes vary from campus to campus, but where it exists it has a visibility and influence far beyond its usually tiny and fluid membership. Its chief significance is that it offers a genuine alternative, however temporary, to the rebellious student seeking a distinctive identity in keeping with his own temperament and experience. In a sense it provides some intellectual content and meaning to the idealism and rebelliousness generated in adolescence in some parts of American society. While the preceding three types of students pursue fun, a diploma, or knowledge, these students pursue an identity, not as a by-product, but as the primary and often self-conscious aim of their education. And their symbol is often a distinctive style--of dress, speech, attitude--that itself represents the identity they seek.²⁹

The nonconformist students themselves presently announce the purposes of their actions under two banners, love and radical democracy.

²⁹Newcomb and Wilson, op. cit., pp. 23-24.

Sometimes one needs only to read the placards as they are carried by or read the buttons and bumper stickers to be informed of these two latter purposes of their actions.

These purposes, of course, are not unique to nonconformist students, but the dominance of their concern for them and the manner of serving them are much in contrast to other students. For many nonconformists their identity is more and more formed, not by measuring up or even conflicting with the immediately older generation, but by engaging the forms of imagination and articulation bequeathed by the aristocratic traditions of the past, by the Orient, or the sensuousness and grittiness of the present poor, especially the Negro. Superficially, this may mean beards, beads, sandals, serapes, American Indian lore, eastern Indian music, very long hair, wearing Edwardian regimentals, tinted sun glasses, boots, buttons, flowers, and the rainbow of colors and patterns in the Mod wardrobe. More deeply, it means that the way to the self is sought expansively through the expressiveness of the poor, popular culture, the performing arts, psychedelia, drugs, and great intimacy and feeling for one another.

This is an "open" generation. Less fearful in so many respects, it is less to be intimidated by all or any of the bogies that persuaded their fathers to exchange the tender skin of the expansible self for the character armor of the safe one. The possible rewards of intimacy are held higher than the risks.³⁰

Identity is not much sought in winning approval from their elders or by finding one's "place" among them or even by overthrowing them--"If you win the rat race you are still a rat"--but by expression,

³⁰Robert Hutchins, et al., "The University in American" (Santa Barbara, California: Fund for the Republic, 1967), p. 41.

stimulation, experience, and contemplation. Their elders seem to the nonconformists to force their identity into what they do for a living, or how they are doing, and what they are going to do next. The nonconformists tend to opt out of this forever forward looking busyness and look for themselves in more sensate abandonment to the present.

But their game is played for higher stakes than those of the mere sensualist. This is not self-indulgence, but a struggle for identity that finds proof of existence in the scream of the senses and proof of worth in an acceptance by others, no matter what the circumstances.³¹

Bridging and equalling the concern for identity-seeking of the nonconformists and their concern for radical democracy is their concern for love. A part of the contemporary nonconformist subculture has earned the label, "The Love Generation," from the mass media for the whole subculture. Such a label is partly sensational journalism and partly something of a "put-on," to use a late nonconformist term, advanced by the students themselves. But the bridge is there both in substance and style. As the identity-seeking is done aesthetically, in intense experience, and in great intimacy with peers, so the democracy which is sought includes heightened individual participation in political decisions at the grass roots and upward, sometimes the sharing of property, pacifism or non-violence, antipathy toward technology, and such personal diversity that only a great tolerance for idiosyncrasy could bond one man to another. As love in the sense of ready acceptance of peers, whatever may be their "thing" (possibly the closest nonconformist term for "vocation"), and also in the sense of erotic

³¹Smith, op. cit., p. 181.

stimulation of one another softens the competition and strife in their identity-seeking style, so also does love in the same senses soften their political style. Softening does not at all mean a naiveté about power or conflict, but the use of different kinds of power--the power of the poor and exploited to unsettle consciences of the rich, the playful power of harrassment and embarrassment of the establishment, the power of sufficient numbers of the powerless to halt action by sitting in its way, the power of serving one another and raising an attractive model of a new way of life to keep the larger society guessing.

To be "left" in the eyes of youthful rebels does not mean to adhere to a political program, but rather to assent to an ethic and method of social relations. Organizations within the student movement acclaim pure democracy as a cornerstone of their beliefs--to such an extent that meetings often border on anarchy. Decisions do not become the prerogative of the leadership clique; the total membership in attendance must achieve consensus before pronouncing policy. They label this tenet "participatory democracy" and it applies to all institutions. Student rebels express great dissatisfaction with the liberal democracy which governs current society. They perceive it primarily as rule by a power elite which no longer heeds, and often blocks, the opinions of ordinary citizens. For this reason the committed student prepares Negroes for registration, tutors the educationally disadvantaged, and demonstrates in favor of the self-determination of peoples in Latin America and Viet Nam. Under participatory democracy, beneficiaries as well as administrators would structure and guide institutional programs; thus, students would assist in the governance of the college and university. The new breed of student considers these ideals truly American in origin, and regrets their disappearance in the present political structure.³²

The political tactics of the student nonconformists have stressed a non-violent course of action to occasion reflection in those who use violence and oppression to protect something they know to be

³²Ibid., p. 166.

indefensible in the light of reason, democracy, and the Judaeo-Christian tradition. Certainly such non-violence tactics as the boycott, sit-in, extended marches, and the exacerbation of situations to the point of nationwide newsworthiness and federal intervention were more than inducements to reflection but coercive forms of power, too. This approach was, however, understood to be a course of love, and until now most nonconformists have accepted the discipline of non-violence because of its pragmatic success. Non-violence, one student states, "is supremely the weapon of the dispossessed, the underprivileged, and the egalitarian, not of those who are still addicted to private profit, commercial values, and great wealth."³³ In the last two years, however, a part of the nonconformist subculture has tended to become more belligerent and, on occasion, violent, and another part has taken up an apolitical position or expatriation.

Leaders of integration campaigns, free speech drives, civil liberties organizations, and peace movements are often speaking out these days against the widespread desertion of their causes by youths who have turned to swinging instead of sweating out social reform.³⁴

Others have moved to a more calculated revolutionary position sanctioning draft resistance over conscientious objection, aiding the alleged enemies of the United States, and some of the more extreme measures of black power, including incendiarism and sabotage. A new style may be emerging in which love does not bridge their concerns for identity and

¹Ibid., p. 167.

²J. L. Simmons and Barry Winograd, It's Happening (Santa Barbara, California: Marc-Laird, 1967), p. 81.

democracy, and all is frustration and anger. One is too close to the times at this point to discern them much further.

III. A THEOLOGICAL VIEW OF THREE DOMINANT CONCERNS OF NONCONFORMIST STUDENTS

Identity-Seeking and Eschatology. For the Christian man his identity is ultimately that identity God gives him in Christ, and it is an identity held by faith until the work of God in Christ is brought to fulfillment. It is an eschatological identity, and no man can pronounce the last judgment of himself or another until the future is in. For the Christian man, his true life is hid with Christ in God, and only dimly does it now appear what he shall be. Short of the eschaton, a paradoxical identity of sinner and saint obtains. When considered in such a framework of simul jus et peccator, the identity-seeking of a Christian in less than ultimate terms is spared from both pride and despair. He is never so lost he is lost to God, and he is never so found that God has nothing further to reveal to him of himself. From the beginning of Christian life in baptism--in which the Christian ultimately takes the name of God as the one who identifies him and is introduced to the Christian life style of dying and rising on the basis of that identity--to the end of that life which was daily lost and found, the Christian lives identified by grace through faith in the same sense the sinner is said to be justified by grace through faith.

When one moves from the ultimate terms to more relative terms--from who I am before God to who I am before myself and other men--there is a notable breakdown in our time of help in the former terms reaching

the problems posed in the latter terms. The preaching ministry to contemporary nonconformist students may not even be possible, but the ministry of much listening, watching, and waiting, and the ministry of taking instruction and common action in specific issues is open. It may be that some nonconformist students are closer to what it means in our times to "put on Christ," to use Christian terms, and to search for identity in Christian existence than many other students less concerned in nonconformist ways.

In the nonconformist subculture there is much one would have to call the achievement of semi-identity at best or pseudo-identity at worst. As a substitute for genuine identity-seeking a few use the language, clothing, music, manners, and poses of deprived and oppressed, or delinquent and criminal groups.³⁵ There may be some playfulness and experimentation with such a style for some, but for many there is a kind of seriousness of commitment to it which substitutes for the further search for personal distinctness, not to mention distinction. Also, there may be, as there is in David Mallery's estimation of the Ferment on Campus, an identification with the oppressed occurring, especially the Negro, in which some nonconformists act out their own struggle for freedom from the adult world in the terms of a national issue.³⁶ If so, such students, not to mention the civil rights movement, are more greatly helped to a more truly personal identity when

³⁵Rolf Muuss, Theories of Adolescence (New York: Random House, 1962), p. 77.

³⁶David Mallery, Ferment on Campus (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), p. 58.

they are helped to discover what they are really doing, stop playing "white Negro" and other games, and get down to the hard work within their own communities to stop white oppression which arouses necessarily retaliatory black power.

The ministry of the church could urge that the same sharpness with which the banality and moral degeneration of white, middle-class life is scored be as often turned on the manufactured rebelliousness and delinquency of parts of the nonconformist student subculture.

No doubt youth has always, and appropriately, expressed its rebellion, but it has never existed in a circumstance where the gestures of rebelliousness have been manufactured for the young as they now are. Mass communication and mass production have made possible the dissemination of what might be termed expressive postures and expressive products. These products are highly profitable to the producers and distributors, but we are still quite unaware of the "social costs." Today we have an industry concerned with the canalization and manipulation of youthful rebelliousness, which it succeeds in transforming into delinquent, anti-intellectual defiance.³⁷

A nonconformist pseudo-identity can be purchased in a society which markets anything that will sell, and it is ironic how much nonconformity in style depends upon the very commercialism it deplores.

If the ministry of the church could well speak a stronger word against the commercial exploitation of the young than it does, it also could well examine its own ministries to them. Some "Hippier than thou" campus ministries only confuse authentic identity-seeking among those who would be served. If the "university now has to begin a process of 'de-indoctrination' of young people before its own mission

³⁷Marjorie Reeves (ed.), Eighteen Plus (London: Faber and Faber, 1965), p. 60.

can be begun," and "to create a pervasive atmosphere in which its own values are dominant, unequivocal, and resistant to the values of the wider society,"³⁸ then so also might the ministry of the church be bolder to speak about its own understanding of human identity-seeking and divine identity-giving in contrast to that of some nonconformists. Every Hippie commune, for example, is not the repristination of New Testament Christian community and every social protest is not the repristination of the Judaeo-Christian prophetic tradition.³⁹ The identity-seeking of the nonconformists will be helped more by clearly distinguishing their actions from the Christian community and tradition than by making over-eager connections. And it will be similarly more helped by a Christian community which is unavenging of those individuals who do not seem to care to ask for its recognition of their identity formation and by preaching which is slower to berate them for their lack of commitment.

Most importantly, in the judgment of this writer, the ministry of the church ought to be encouraging greater experimentation with limited commitments among the nonconformists and other students than is now occurring. This writer discerns a growing amount of premature commitment in the nonconformist subculture, a narrowing creative core

³⁸ Ibid., p. 65.

³⁹ A television feature editor on the Huntley-Brinkley news program of December 13, 1967, reports that the mass media and commercial interests, in the eyes of some nonconformists, created the Hippie movement from which the authentic must now disassociate themselves. Campus ministries which find their coffee houses half filled need to take note before they try Love-ins.

and a widening fringe. In the past we are told there was a period in the life of the young which Erik Erikson, Margaret Mead, and others have called a "psychological moratorium," an "as if" period during which the young could experiment without having to show anything for it. There is also some evidence that there has occurred a foreclosure of this moratorium, not only brought about by the academic and career pressures and the weight of current military events upon the young but by the young themselves.⁴⁰ Peer tyranny, the hardening of youth's contrast with adulthood "into an ideal or actual pattern of heightened sensibility."⁴¹ and a studied, sentimental hopelessness which closes history are within the nonconformist subculture. In times in which many older, "quite ordinary people have been tempted to assume the risk of deciding whether to continue to be what they have been or to exchange themselves [or] . . . have had self-substitution forced upon them,"⁴² the identity-seeking of nonconformist students sometimes looks like identity-denying by comparison.

The Christian ministry announces and acts on the promise of God that salvation is unto all generations and that each stage of life of an individual in any generation will be fulfilled. Identification by grace through faith--namely that a Christian is ultimately able to say "I am God's" in spite of any other identification to the contrary,

⁴⁰Muuss, op. cit., p. 77.

⁴¹Erikson, Challenge of Youth, p. 56.

⁴²Harold Rosenberg, The Tradition of the New (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965), p. 10.

including the root evil identification, "I am God"--means that one need not deny history and individuality by identifying himself so dominantly in the terms of any one stage of life or in terms of one college generation. Sociologically speaking, participation in diverse groups of all ages frees a person from the limitations of any one and provides the mechanism whereby he may, by turns, rise above them all.⁴³

Christianly speaking, participation in the community of faith is to receive one's identity from God in the company of the enduring nonconformists in all generations and within a much wider range of understanding of each stage along life's way and its consummation than any one generation, still less any group within one generation, can command.

Love and Judgment. "Eschatology," writes Paul Althaus, "is within the dialectics of the law and the Gospel."

That is to say, we are assigned by God both to the state of responsibility to Him and to the state of salvation; as such we are not rejected by his love in spite of the fact that we cannot justify ourselves before Him. In this state of salvation, we are accepted as His children. From the view of eschatology, the state of responsibility never ends, that even at the end we are faced with a responsibility to God (the judgment). Similarly, the present state of salvation means, from the view of eschatology, that the love of God which grasps us through the Gospel remains directed to everybody unalterably and that it will resolve, in the glory of "eternal life," the contradiction that men, although declared to be the sons of God, remain both in sin and before the inevitability of death.⁴⁴

⁴³Keith McFarland (ed.), Urbanization and the College Student (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1966), p. 43.

⁴⁴Marvin Halverson (ed.), Handbook of Christian Theology (New York: Meridian, 1958), p. 102.

Moving beyond reflection upon the identity-seeking concern of nonconformist students to reflection upon another, very much linked, dominant concern among them, namely love, the prism of eschatology continues to direct that reflection. Here, however, a Christian understanding of the relationship of love and judgment and Gospel and law is the facet of emphasis.

In Althaus' summary of Christian eschatology, it is stated that "the love of God which grasps us through the Gospel remains directed to everybody unalterably" and that "even at the end we are faced with a responsibility to God (the judgment)." The conclusion in the quotation is that only beyond history "in the glory of 'eternal life'" is the judgment of God of man's irresponsibility resolved in His love. The relationship of God's love and His judgment within history in particular events, and the Christian response of love and judgment in them, is one of complexity in both Christian existence and thought and cannot be developed here in any depth. Christians confess that both the love and the judgment of God are uniquely united in Christ in a way which makes His judgment the first edge of His love. The experience of Christians of the love of God in Christ is the basis of their love given to themselves and to others in response, and their experience of the judgment of God in Christ is the basis of their knowledge that their love given in response is short of His love for them and all men. The love God gives is not a simple human possibility, even as it enables and enlightens all human love.

The love given high value among student nonconformists is manifold. Considering some of them under the rubric, "The New Breed,"

Andrew Greeley, priest and sociologist, marks their great concern for those things taken up under the aspect of identity-seeking in the last section, and then he goes on to say:

With this concern for integrity and authenticity comes an inability to be devious or opportunistic--or event diplomatic. The New Breed wants to help people and wants to be loved by them. They are anxious about loving and being loved, or more precisely about whether they are able to love. They are worried about "fulfillment."⁴⁵

They are concerned to love selflessly at the same time they are concerned for themselves that they be loved and fulfilled. Certainly this manifold concern is not unique to student nonconformists. But within the nonconformist subculture it is pronounced and sometimes breaks under pressure into the extremes, tending toward the total gratification of self in a warm eros or toward a total renunciation of self in a cool agape. Clearly these are tendencies toward extremes never fully reached. In the former direction, some nonconformists variously called trippers, swingers, happeners, druggies, and the turned-on tuned-inners tend to gather. In the latter direction some nonconformists of the "New Student Left" and other seekers of radical and absolute democracy tend to gather. The first group is discussed in this section, and the second is discussed in the last section of this chapter where the kind of love toward which they tend takes on special political significance.

The swingers (for want of a better term) have, as noted earlier, earned the label "The Love Generation" for almost all the student

⁴⁵Smith, op. cit., p. 158.

nonconformists. The "Love is God," "My button loves your button," "Unbutton," and "Fondle me" buttons; the groin-gripping pants and "Hello officer" mini-skirts; the teasing "With our love--we could save the world--if they only knew" song lyrics and tunes;⁴⁶ and the Love-ins, skinny-dippings, body-paintings, and beach-parties of a certain character celebrate, titillate, and warmly offer up the erotic life for one another. Swinger love is sensual, spontaneous, and serendipital at its best, whether given to the fragrance of a flower, the chance patterns of colors in a kaleidoscope, the grace of the carriage of a surfer riding a wave, or the sounds of a sitar. Things are loved because they are beautiful and make one feel good, and things are beautiful and feel good because they are loved.

When swinger love is given to another human being, it does not necessarily mean sexual intercourse, although sexual intercourse is not ruled out beforehand. Indeed, little is ruled out beforehand, for swingers tend to love with only the restraints of exhaustion or saturation whatever stimulates. Swinger love is allegedly begetting in character, eros increasing eros and increasing the love of the initial giver, and there are no pre-set limits of where this spiral of cause and effect may lead. While there are obviously no statistical studies or norms in this matter, it does appear that swinger love is usually

⁴⁶From the song "Within You" in the Beatles' Sergeant Pepper's Lonely Hearts' Club Band album, Northern Songs, Limited, London, England, 1967. While the passage is meant to be representative of a whole genre of lyrics, it may be noted that a peculiar kind of erotic "Kingdom of Heaven" is "Within You" as far as this particular song is dominantly concerned.

given and its return aroused in a whole style of swinger life in which the specific act of sexual intercourse is not overplayed. Swingers suspect that only the straight and repressed would expect or need eros to center in sexual intercourse and that most of the readership of Playboy is "over thirty." Simply to share those things and times which are erotically stimulating--particular kinds of music and dance, a hot beach and a cool ocean, a fast car or a walk in a rain storm--with another person who feels the same way is an experience of love. "Grooving," "picking up vibrations," being "with it" and "where it's at," "going up" together and "getting high," and other late expressions in the swinger argot, if separable from their references to drugs and translatable at all, seem to refer to experiences of sympathetic eros. There may be things and times shared quietly, contemplatively, or romantically in hideaways or things and times shared very loudly, to a rapid beat, in much abandon in public places. The swingers swing in several tempos of sympathetic eros.

This feeling good together among some nonconformists is an emotional state and a kind of loving which the colleges and the ministries of the churches within them have rarely encouraged, surely not as it appears presently in the extreme, nor was it generally encouraged in the days of Christendom.

In Western nations, especially since the Reformation, the officials and members of mainstream society have looked upon such states with particular suspicion and disfavor, and have acted to curtail them, even in such natural trip-inducing areas as religion and love.⁴⁷

⁴⁷Simmons and Winograd, op. cit., p. 34.

The contemporary ministry of the church among persons for whom such love is a dominant concern is one in which the Christian must first take on their flesh, if not also his own if his special sin has been denying it and the rest of creation. Swinging may be accepted graciously, for from the cantus firmus of the grace of God which the Christian trusts as the ground bass of life, he, better enabled than any other, can hear best the polyphony of other kinds of loving. He will be able to discern the gemutlichkeit from the hedonism, the hearty delight from the headlong immolation, and the celebration of sensation from the cry for help. The man who so begins a ministry to swingers may perceive patterns in their loving which cannot be perceived in detachment. Mervin Freedman, who has studied the resurgence of eros among college students most extensively, seems to perceive a pattern running through sometimes apparently disparate nonconformist behavior. Seeking the restoration of community in the colleges, the unity of the intellect and everything else about the personality, the ethic of social service in the modern world, and the freeing of the impulse life of man is to him a manifold search which begins in the "erotic imagination."⁴⁸

Secondly, the Christian ministry needs next to seek to illuminate the sympathetic eros of the nonconformists for whom such attitudes and actions are heightened in the light of the divine agape. That is,

⁴⁸Freedman, op. cit., p. 175. The last phrase is borrowed directly from Henry Murray. Paul Goodman has also examined the revival of eros among college students generally in his works cited elsewhere in this paper.

in Christ. The judgment of such sympathetic eros will not be legal condemnation but the word of the divine agape which preserves a positive place for eros within the goodness of man's created nature and its fulfillment within the purpose of God. The perfection of eros in the light of the divine agape is enabled by the same agape. The judgment of God is the first edge of His love, makes a gracious claim on all human loves, and what His love reveals of the sickness and shortcomings of human love it also frees and enlivens human love to close and heal. Should anyone trust this divine love, there follows the understanding that human love is not only a matter of holding another's hand and feeling for the pulsing, endless dance but also of turning together, reaching out to the world by widening the circle, and of moving toward compassion as well as sympathy, suffering as well as "grooving."

More importantly, the divine agape draws men beyond the minimal requirements of self-affirmation in loving the neighbor as they love themselves and toward loving themselves and others as He loves them. Love arrested in sympathetic eros, in feeling good together, can mean indulgence or even indifference to the persons involved. The Golden Rule, potentially so dependent upon what a man desires for himself, can mean if this or that is all I want for myself this or that is all I allow my neighbor. And such maxims like "Hang loose," "Take it easy, but take it," and other variants of "Don't do anything I wouldn't do" do abound among the swingers. Making someone feel good is not all there is to love, however, and some swingers suspect that they really need much more than that. The ministry of the church responds to real need and its divine commission when it points swingers to a love

beyond euphoria and all they, or the church, can ask or think of one another.

Radical Democracy and the Kingdom of God. Another extreme introduced earlier is a constellation of attitudes and actions in the nonconformist student subculture which gathers behind the attempt to make a kind of love into politics called radical or participatory democracy. Certainly more enters into their politics than a kind of love; special attitudes toward freedom, power, authority, law, war, wealth, and justice are as much at issue as they must be in politics. Generally speaking, however, the love of the political nonconformists colors these other ingredients and has, until recently, been dominant among them. It is a love which may be characterized as a deep feeling for the poor and powerless which is neither pity nor paternalism but psychological identification and political solidarity with them in a struggle to create and participate in radical democracy. Such love of some nonconformists has a selfless character to it in that they reject many of the privileges which would be their's by virtue of their social class, race, wealth, and education. Reflection upon this nonconformist concern for participatory democracy, born of such love, in the light of the Kingdom of God is the burden of this closing section.

Richard Luecke says that "for faith the decisive clue to the distinction between law and love is that love means seeing the neighbor together with one's self as encompassed in the Kingdom of God" or "in

Christ."⁴⁹ When love is commanded, as in the "New Commandment" to love as we are loved by God in Christ, the "now, but yet to break in" character of the Kingdom is the ethos of that ethics. The "New Commandment" describes covenanted relationships in the Kingdom of God brought near in Christ and to be fulfilled in Him. He does not abolish the law, but fulfills it and adds something to it. Seeing men not only as "humanity" or simply as "equals" but also as neighbors and brothers and as concrete individuals having differences which are valued and creative "in Christ" is to see them like ourselves encompassed in the Kingdom of God. The paradoxical way in which the "New Commandment" to love is put is descriptive both of the present need for such love and of the ordinary inability to give it, much less on command. As the Kingdom of God is a perpetual gift of God and not the work of men, so also is the love which He commands. The "in Christ" relationships of the Kingdom are gifts and not the bases of political programs.

Such relationships of love, however, are politically significant. When realized by anticipation in the church, they are the source of visions of a new community and the source of comfort and encouragement when the work of politics is hard and long. In a discussion of the ministry of the church to politically active students, Harvey Cox stresses these two functions of the church.

But to relapse into theology again, the first of the two traditional idioms for the church is the eschatological community; that is, the community of hope, or vision where you have . . . intelligent ideas about how to reconstruct society. I would

⁴⁹Richard Luecke, New Meanings for New Beings (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), p. 127.

emphasize very strongly that that's the first function. But there is a second function which I think is the fellowship of the saints or the blessed community, where people are kept alive while we're getting a new society, which we're not going to do tomorrow or next week.⁵⁰

The Kingdom of God, which is His reign of justifying love, is His own work among men. Among those in whom that work is being wrought, the works of justice among men are appropriate responses. For what can be commanded as love cannot are closer approximations of justice, that is policies and actions which make further manifestations of love possible. "Men who understand this," concludes Luecke, "will not seek laws which require the fulfillment of covenant relationships, but only such as make these relationships possible and do not contradict them."⁵¹ The way of love is to make law the issue in public discussion. Or, as it is sometimes put in Christian reflection, justification is God's work and justice is man's work.

Candor and clarity about the contemporary campus situation requires that the scant interest in working for justice among "religious" students be noted along with the scant interest in "religion" of students working for justice. Among the former an inversion of justification and justice seems to occur, making justice the work of God and justification the work of man. At least this would be a possible theological interpretation of much sociological research which finds those students who identify themselves as religious almost

⁵⁰Ilene Montana (ed.), "The New Student" (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Church Society for College Work, 1967), p. 54.

⁵¹Luecke, op. cit., p. 134.

invariably "other-directed" and "status-oriented" and little interested in seeking justice or discharging social and political responsibilities. Philip Jacob's following summary of sociological research into college student religion is ten years old, but more recent research does not basically alter it.

A real hiatus separates religious interest and social responsibility. Few students seem to recognize social or humanitarian implications in their religious faith. Firm belief in God does not seem to diminish prejudice toward people of other races. Indeed, strong religious belief tends to be associated with racial and ethnic prejudice. Students' religion does not usually increase their willingness to accept others if it involves some expense to themselves. Nor does it lead them to become personally active in the promotion of justice in human relations. . . . Actually, the less religious tend to be the more humanitarian and the more concerned about social justice and misery.⁵²

Slightly more recently, the Goldsen study showed the same religious-ethical situation obtaining, although with fewer of the religiously identified students very deeply committed to religious activities. In that study, 80 per cent of the respondents, for example, replied positively to the question "Do you, personally, feel the need to believe in some sort of religious faith or philosophy?" at the same time 83 per cent of the respondents did not mention religious activities among those they most expected to give themselves to in their lifetimes. Work, the family, and leisure were way ahead of religious activities, the latter trailed only by the activities of citizenship.⁵³ It is difficult to know how to take instruction from such research, given

⁵²Philip Jacob, Changing Values in College (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 54.

⁵³Rose Goldsen, et al., What College Students Think (Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1960), p. 156.

the forms of the questions, but Goldsen concludes that "The students' beliefs are 'secular' in the sense that religious activities cannot compete with the family-centeredness, the work-centeredness, and even the leisure-centeredness of their society."⁵⁴ This writer could even conceive of a committed Christian answering the first question negatively because of its theological awkwardness in the use of the term "faith," and "religious activities" is ambiguous in the second. However, it seems safe to say there is (1) a widespread student interest in religion--in Goldsen's terms, in something "to give meaning to their lives and to bridge the gap between the manifest [sic] occurrences of daily life and the ultimate meaning of these occurrences,"⁵⁵ (2) a lessening commitment to religious institutions and activities, (3) a possibility that strong religious concerns are practically invested in the job, the home, and leisure, and (4) little religious concern issuing in the seeking of justice and responsibilities of citizenship.

On the other hand, there seems to be some evidence that the most politically active students are the least religiously interested, at least formally. "Nonconformists," writes David Gottlieb in a recent study using the Clark-Trow typology directly at a large Midwest public university, "were more likely than respondents in other subcultures to report a decline in feeling of religious commitment and need for a religious faith."⁵⁶ A student activist writes: "Those in the movement rarely belong to an organized religion, and those who do tend toward a 'social gospel' approach to Christianity. Most claim

⁵⁴Ibid.

⁵⁵Ibid.

⁵⁶Gottlieb and Ramsey, op. cit., p. 195.

to be agnostics and atheists."⁵⁷ Paul Heist, in a study of eleven key leaders of student protest movements on three different campuses in 1964, writes:

All eleven . . . came from homes where the religious affiliations were of a liberal nature or perhaps could be described as tenuous or unimportant. Over half of these students classified themselves as agnostics or non-religious as entering freshmen; two were members of the American Friends Society; none of them were active or participative in a denominational group at the time of graduation. I hasten to add that, in a generic sense of the term, one might be in error to glibly describe them as non-religious. We came to know them and understand them as men and women morally concerned about numerous social and political topics and given to examining the ethical bases of their decisions and behavior.⁵⁸

Nonconformist students generally identify even less with the churches than they do with the colleges, and the politically active nonconformists least of all. Their atheism and agnosticism, however, is not militant. When the churches are given any attention, they are not particularly faulted for their doctrines of God. Rather, the churches are merged in their view into the rest of the "establishment" or "system" and to be faulted for their moral failures. In a previous generation it may have been the case that college students sought a more intellectually defensible doctrine of God from the churches or perhaps a greater engagement with the fine arts, but for the present for these volatile few nothing less than the moral conversion of the church will do. The swinger may say 'May the baby Jesus shut your mouth and blow

⁵⁷Smith, op. cit., p. 165.

⁵⁸Owen Knorr and W. John Minter (eds.), Order and Freedom on the Campus (Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, 1965), p. 63.

your mind," but the activist is more likely to say unprintable versions of "Put your money where your mouth is." The Jesus of the swingers is frequently the Jesus of romanticism--the mild, bearded and sandaled, drop-out and dreamer of the Galilean hills who considered the lilies of the field and cuddled lambs. The politically active nonconformists make few references to Jesus. Gandhi's doctrine of satyagraha or "soul force" lies more behind their early tactics of love non-violence, and the existentialism of Camus' Rebel lies more behind their more recent resistance tactics than anything specifically Christian. One feels that the congruence of words and deeds they would seek from the church is nothing short of incarnation.

The ministry of the church tries to be one of word and deed agreed together. In the case of the nonconformist students seeking radical democracy, the Christian may reasonably disagree that they can make politics out of their particular love for people and a growing negation of the present order and its modest approximations of justice at the same time he may find himself linked in many common causes with them. More specifically, he asks whether non-violent non-cooperation can be politics as well as it can be protest and what happens to love for people when order and even modest approximations of justice are negated. Still more specifically, he asks what happens to love in disorder.

Within the camp of student non-violent non-cooperation there seems to be an ideological-tactical [word-deed, attitude-action] drift: from love non-violence, to non-violent hostility, to non-violent

hostile disruptive activity in the grey area of legality, to non-violent hostile disruptive illegal activity.⁵⁹

Paul Potter, a past president of Students for a Democratic Society, says that radical negation was not created by the movement.

It was born in society that refused to confront its most basic problems, and it is the inherited burden of this generation of students to play out that negation, to go to the verge of nihilism, and perhaps beyond, in their search for a positive that is powerful enough to overcome the negative.⁶⁰

While some nonconformists may feel this negation to be an end to all compromising, morally purifying, and even heroic, the Christian will think it misplaced. For the Christian man, the negation of systems and structures, orders and authorities, is too simple in its extreme. Consistency would lead to anarchy, the final negation of order where no love is possible, not to mention democracy. The Christian man rather works to put forth structures and orders which are more just and make love more possible without illusions about absolute justice being a political possibility and without nihilism when approximations of justice require compromise and political organizations capable of winning and wielding power. The Kingdom of God is already the great negation of all human orders at the same time it is the "positive that is powerful enough to overcome the negative" in all human orders. The Christian who works politically out of the reign of God's justifying love need not be heroic but faithful. He need not unsully himself from

⁵⁹Ronald Barnes, et al. (eds.), The Aim of Higher Education (St. Louis: United Campus Christian Fellowship, 1966), p. 18.

⁶⁰Knorr and Minter, op. cit., p. 78.

systems to be morally purified but trust in God's grace. He is free to work on structures and orders without absolute affirmation or negation of any and endure in hope the work of seeking justice and the making of love more possible. If he makes that hope evident in his deeds in dark days, possibly a few students may become curious about the faith and the love which sustains it, radically.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY

The necessarily general manner in which college student culture is characterized in this dissertation is made possible by much summarizing in the paper proper. Many details are present only in summaries and outlines, and the basic typology used is a great abstraction of many particulars. The writer would hope, however, that rich and evocative enough details are advanced to ground the four college student subcultures in the experience of the reader and that the generalizations, especially about the dominant concerns of each subculture, are visibly, if discursively, supported and do the least possible violence to the particulars necessarily denied to the paper as well as to those admitted.

Discussing first the abstracting nature of typologies of college student subcultures in sociological research and the understanding of college students in the history of the ministry of the church, the writer proceeds on a sociological definition of college student culture as "the shared notions of what constitutes right attitudes and actions toward the range of issues confronted in college" and describes the present attitudes and actions of each of four subcultures suggested by Burton Clark and Martin Trow.¹ He provides some, primarily historical and sociological, background for grasping some of the cultural

¹See pp. 2 and 6 et seqq.

realities which give students certain notions to share and constitute the rightness of their attitudes and actions as they see that right. From time to time, especially in short story introductions to the four main chapters, he exemplifies the attitudes and actions in a few selected issues and experiences contemporarily confronted in college.

Those attitudes and actions found to be heightened in frequency and intensity over others in each subculture he examines for the manifestation of dominant concerns. "For where your treasure is," says Jesus, "there will your heart be also."² Three closely related dominant concerns of each subculture are each conceptualized and brought into the light of Christian reflection. In this dissertation this means the ways the gospel of justification by grace through faith in Jesus Christ informs Christian life and the ministry of the church and works both for and against the students' attitudes and actions according to their shared notions of what constitutes the right. In each case the conceptualized dominant concerns are discussed in affirmative and negative relations with a Christian doctrine or theme in which the gospel is ramified and with which the dominant concern resonates.

The collegiate student subculture embraces and supports students dominantly concerned for fun, social skills, and loyalty to the college, especially its co-curricular activities. Christian joy is related affirmatively and negatively to collegiate fun; Christian community to social skills; and existence in faith to collegiate loyalties.

The vocational student subculture embraces and supports students

²Matthew 6:21.

dominantly concerned for upward social mobility, technical skills, and employment at good incomes. Justification by grace through faith is related affirmatively and negatively to social mobility; Christian stewardship with technical skill seeking; and the Christian calling with employment and vocational training.

The academic student subculture embraces and supports students dominantly concerned for good grades, scholarly discipline, and knowledge, frequently but not exclusively of a specialized kind. The grace of God given for accounting personal worth is related affirmatively and negatively to grade seeking; Christian discipleship to scholarly discipline, and a Christian understanding of truth with academic knowledge.

The nonconformist student subculture embraces and supports students dominantly concerned with identity-seeking, love, and radical democracy. Eschatological existence is related affirmatively and negatively to nonconformist identity-seeking; the gracious judgment of God to certain kinds of love sought among these students; and the Kingdom of God to their political activity.

Throughout the dissertation, in which some effort is made to write a continuous essay under the dominant concerns lifted up to link and locate them lest they appear more discontinuous than they are in the actualities of college student culture, some comment regarding the work of the ministry is offered where the gospel illumines a concrete student situation and suggests possibly appropriate ministering words and deeds.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

.....

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Allport, Gordon. The Individual and His Religion. New York: Macmillan, 1962.
- Astin, Alexander. Who Goes Where to College? Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1965.
- The Atlantic Editors. The Troubled Campus. Boston: Little, Brown, 1966.
- Barnes, Ronald, et al. (eds.) The Aim of Higher Education: Social Adjustment or Human Liberation? St. Louis: United Campus Christian Fellowship, 1966.
- Barzun, Jacques. Teacher in America. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1954.
- Baskin, Samuel (ed.). Higher Education: Some Newer Developments. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- Bidwell, Charles (ed.). The American College and Student Personality. Andover, Massachusetts: Social Science Research Council, 1960.
- Blaine, Graham, Jr., and Charles McArthur (eds.). Emotional Problems of the Student. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1966.
- Bolton, Charles, and Kenneth Kammeyer. The University Student: A Study of Student Behavior and Values. New Haven: College and University Press, 1967.
- Boroff, David. Campus, U.S.A. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961.
- Brookover, Wilber, et al. The College Student. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1965.
- Cantelon, John. A Protestant Approach to the Campus Ministry. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.
- Caplow, Theodore, and Reece McGee. The Academic Marketplace. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1965.
- Carpenter, Marjorie (ed.). The Larger Learning. Dubuque: Brown, 1960.
- Cohen, Joseph (ed.). The Superior Student in American Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

- Cohen, Mitchell (ed.). The New Student Left. Boston: Beacon Press, 1966.
- Coleman, A. John. The Task of the Christian in the University. New York: Association Press, 1947.
- Cox, Harvey. The Secular City. New York: Macmillan, 1965.
- Cuninggim, Merrimon. The College Seeks Religion. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947.
- Davis, James. Great Aspirations. Chicago: Aldine, 1964.
- Dennis, Lawrence, and Joseph Kauffman (eds.). The College and the Student. Washington: American Council on Education, 1966.
- Draper, Hal. Berkeley: The New Student Revolt. New York: Grove Press, 1965.
- Earnshaw, George (ed.). The Campus Ministry. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1964.
- Eddy, Edward, Jr. The College Influence on Student Character. Washington: American Council on Education, 1959.
- Erikson, Erik (ed.). The Challenge of Youth. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1965.
- Farnsworth, Dana. Psychiatry, Education, and the Young Adult. Springfield, Illinois: Thomas, 1966.
- Freedman, Mervin. The College Experience. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967.
- Friedenberg, Edgar. The Vanishing Adolescent. New York: Dell, 1959.
- Fuller, Edmund (ed.). The Christian Idea of Education. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.
- Goldsen, Rose, et al. What College Students Think. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1960.
- Goodman, Paul. Compulsory Mis-Education and the Community of Scholars. New York: Vintage, 1964.
- _____. Growing Up Absurd. New York: Random House, 1960.
- Gottlieb, David, and Charles Ramsey. The American Adolescent. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1964.

- Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, Committee on the College Student. Sex and the College Student. Greenwich, Connecticut: Fawcett, 1966.
- Halverson, Marvin (ed.). Handbook of Christian Theology. New York: Meridian, 1958.
- Hammond, Phillip. The Campus Clergyman. New York: Basic, 1966.
- Havice, Charles (ed.). Campus Values. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1966.
- Heath, Roy. The Reasonable Adventurer. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964.
- Hettlinger, Richard. Living with Sex: The Student's Dilemma. New York: Seabury Press, 1966.
- Hofmann, Hans. Making the Ministry Relevant. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1960.
- Horowitz, David. Student. New York: Ballantine, 1962.
- Hunt, Everett. The Revolt of the College Intellectual. Chicago: Aldine, 1963.
- Jacob, Philip. Changing Values in College. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.
- Jenkins, Daniel. The Educated Society. London: Faber and Faber, 1966.
- Katope, Christopher, and Paul Zolbrod (eds.). Beyond Berkeley: A Sourcebook in Student Values. New York: World, 1966.
- Kemp, Charles. Counseling with College Students. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- Keniston, Kenneth. The Uncommitted: Alienated Youth in American Society. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1965.
- Kerr, Clark. The Uses of the University. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.
- Kneller, George. Educational Anthropology. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1965.
- Knorr, Owen, and W. John Minter (eds.). Order and Freedom on the Campus. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, 1965.
- LeFevre, Perry. The Christian Teacher. New York: Abingdon Press, 1958.

- Leonard, Eugenie. Origins of Personnel Services in American Higher Education. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956.
- Lloyd-Jones, Esther (ed.). The American Student and His College. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1967.
- Lowry, Howard. The Mind's Adventure: Religion and Higher Education. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1950.
- Luecke, Richard. New Meanings for New Beings. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.
- Lunsford, Terry (ed.). The Study of Campus Cultures. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963.
- Maritain, Jacques. Education at the Crossroads. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962.
- Marris, Peter. The Experience of Higher Education. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964.
- Mallery, David. Ferment on the Campus. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.
- McFarland, Keith (ed.). Urbanization and the College Student. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1966.
- McGrath, Earl (ed.). Universal Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- McLuhan, Marshall. Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- _____ and Quentin Fiore. The Medium is the Massage. New York: Bantam, 1967.
- Michael, Donald. The Next Generation. New York: Vintage, 1965.
- Michaelson, Robert. The Study of Religion in American Universities. New Haven: Society for Religion in Higher Education, 1965.
- Miller, Alexander. Faith and Learning. New York: Association Press, 1960.
- Miller, Michael, and Susan Gilmore (eds.). Revolution at Berkeley. New York: Dell, 1965.
- Moberly, Walter. The Crisis in the University. London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1949.
- Morgan, William. Student Religion During Fifty Years. New York: Association Press, 1935.

- Morison, Robert (ed.). The Contemporary University: U.S.A. Boston: Beacon Press, 1966.
- Mueller, Kate. Student Personnel Work in Higher Education. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1961.
- Muuss, Rolf. Theories of Adolescence. New York: Random House, 1966.
- Nash, Arnold. The University and the Modern World. New York: Macmillan, 1943.
- Nederhood, Joel. The Church's Mission to the Educated American. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961.
- Nelson, J. Robert (ed.). The Christian Student and the Church. New York: Association Press, 1952.
- _____. The Christian Student and the University. New York: Association Press, 1952.
- Newcomb, Theodore, and Everett Wilson (eds.). College Peer Groups. Chicago: Aldine, 1966.
- Newfield, Jack. A Prophetic Minority. New York: New American Library, 1967.
- Newman, John Henry. The Idea of a University. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1959.
- Patillo, Manning (ed.). Church-Sponsored Education in the United States. Washington: American Council on Education, 1966.
- Perkins, James. The University in Transition. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.
- Reeves, Marjorie (ed.). Eighteen Plus: Unity and Diversity in Higher Education. London: Faber and Faber, 1965.
- Riesman, David. Constraint and Variety in American Education. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1958.
- Rosenberg, Harold. The Tradition of the New. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University. New York: Random House, 1965.
- Sanford, Nevitt (ed.). The American College. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1962.

- Schoenfeld, Clarence. The University and Its Publics. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.
- Shedd, Clarence. The Church Follows Its Students. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938.
- _____. Two Centuries of Student Christian Movements. New York: Association Press, 1934.
- Simmons, J. L., and Barry Winograd. It's Happening. Santa Barbara, California: Marc-Laird, 1967.
- Smith, G. Kerry (ed.). Higher Education Reflects on Itself and on the Larger Society. Washington: National Education Association, 1966.
- Smith, Seymour. The American College Chaplaincy. New York: Association Press, 1954.
- Sprague, Hall T. (ed.) Research on College Students. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1960.
- Stroup, Herbert. Toward a Philosophy of Organized Student Activities. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1964.
- The Student in Higher Education. Washington: American Council on Education, 1965.
- Sutherland, Robert, et al, (eds.) Personality Factors on the College Campus. Austin, Texas: Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, 1962.
- Tillich, Paul. The Religious Situation. New York: Meridian, 1956.
- _____. Theology of Culture. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Towner, Milton. Religion in Higher Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931.
- van den Heuvel, Albert (ed.). The New Creation and the New Generation. New York: Friendship Press, 1965.
- von Hoffman, Nicholas. The Multiversity. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.
- Wallace, Walter. Student Culture. Chicago: Aldine, 1966.
- Whittington, H. G. Psychiatry on the College Campus. New York: International Universities Press, 1963.
- Wise, H. Max. They Come for the Best of Reasons. Washington: American Council on Education, 1958.

B. PAMPHLETS

- Barnes, Ronald. "The Role of Campus Ministry in Confronting Problems Facing Higher Education." St. Louis: United Campus Christian Fellowship, 1966.
- Barton, Allen. "Studying the Effects of College Education." New Haven: Edward Hazen Foundation, 1959.
- Bayne, Stephen, Jr. (ed.) "The Faith, The Church, and The University." Cincinnati: Forward Movement Publications, 1959.
- Billing, Einar. "Our Calling." Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.
- Blakemore, W. Barnett. "The Crisis in Vocation." St. Louis: United Campus Christian Fellowship, 1964.
- Brauer, Jerald. "Basic Questions for the Christian Scholar." Chicago: National Lutheran Council Division of College and University Work, n.d.
- Hutchins, Robert, et al. "The University in America." Santa Barbara, California: Fund for the Republic, 1967.
- Lynn, Robert. "Education in the New America." New York: National Council of Churches, 1966.
- Montana, Ilene (ed.). "The New Student." Cambridge, Massachusetts: Church Society for College Work, 1967.
- Peterson, Richard. "On a Typology of College Students." Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1960.
- _____. "The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1964-1965." Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1966.
- Reeves, Marjorie (ed.). "Studies in Education." Geneva: World Student Christian Federation, n.d.
- Sageser, David (ed.). "What Is a Christian College?" New York: National Council of Churches, 1958.
- Schilling, Harold. "The University and the Church." Philadelphia: Department of Campus Christian Life of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., 1955.
- Smith, John. "Value Convictions and Higher Education." New Haven: Edward Hazen Foundation, 1958.

Tolle, Leon. "Faith, Learning and Commitment and the University as a Model for a Campus Ministry." East Lansing, Michigan: Christian Faith and Higher Education Institute, 1963.

Williams, George. "The Theological Idea of the University." New York: National Council of Churches, 1958.

C. PERIODICAL ARTICLES

"Class of '67: The Gentle Desperadoes," The Nation (June 19, 1967), pp. 775-81.

Douglas, Truman B. "New Forms of Ministry: Novelty or Renewal?" Information Service, XLVI:7 (April 8, 1967), 1-4.

Erikson, Erik. "Identity and the Life Cycle," Psychological Issues, I (1959), 18-164.

"The Hippies: Philosophy of a Subculture," Time, XC (July 7, 1967), 18-22.

Kerr, Clark. "The Turmoil in Higher Education," Look, XXXI (April 18, 1967), 17-21.

Langford, Thomas. "Campus Turmoil: A Religious Dimension," Christian Century, LXXXIV (February 8, 1967), 173.

"Man of the Year," Time, LXXXIX (January 6, 1967), 18-23.

"A New University for a New World," The Student World, LIX:1 (1966), 1-135.

"From Periphery to Center," Humanity, III (April 1967), 2.

Sanford, Nevitt (issue ed.). "Personality Development during the College Years," The Journal of Social Issues, XII:5 (1956), 1-71.

Shepherd, Jack. "When College Students Crack Up," Look, XXXI (June 13, 1967), 23-25.

D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Brigante, Thomas. "The Expansion of Learning Possibilities during the College Era: Some Utopian Proposals." Unpublished paper for his colleagues and students at Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California, 1966.

- Clark, Burton, and Martin Trow. "Determining College Student Subcultures." Unpublished study paper for the Center for Study of Higher Education, Berkeley, California, 1960. A slightly revised version of this paper is now published as a chapter in Newcomb and Wilson and is the source for citations in this dissertation.
- Hayward, Sumner (ed.). "Personal Stresses in the Academic Community." Unpublished study paper for Fourth Quadrennial Convocation of Christian Colleges, Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana, June 19, 1966.
- Hodgkinson, Harold, William Rogers, and Frederick Shafer. "The Impact of the American College on Student Values." Unpublished report for the Committee on Research of the Commission on Higher Education, National Council of Churches, New York, 1964.
- Lovell, William (ed.). "The Campus Ministry." Unpublished reports on ministries across the country to National Council of Churches, New York, 1966.
- Monsonis, James. "Trends in Campus Ministry." Unpublished report to National Council of Churches, New York, 1966.
- Nasatir, David. "Collegiate Contexts." Unpublished address to College Student Personnel Institute, Claremont, California, November 3, 1965.
- Noble, Hubert. "The Churches and Higher Education." Unpublished study document for Commission on Higher Education of National Council of Churches, New York, 1963.
- Riesman, David. "Developments and Trends in Higher Education." Unpublished address to the Commission on Higher Education, National Council of Churches, New York, June 10, 1964.
- Warren, Jonathan. "College Student Subcultures as Dimensions of Behavior." Extension of an unpublished paper read at American Education Research Association, New York, February 18, 1967, for his students at the College Student Personnel Institute, Claremont, California, 1967.
- Williams, Daniel Day. "The Christian Mission and Higher Education." Unpublished address to Commission on Higher Education, National Council of Churches, June 10, 1964.

116823

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.